

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XVI

Winter Number, 1946-1947

No. 1

EDITORIAL BOARD

JOHN BAILLIE	NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., <i>Editor-in-Chief</i>	KENNETH S. LATOURETTE
ROBBINS WOLCOTT	GERALD CRAGG	G. ASHTON OLDHAM
BARSTOW	LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT	JAMES R. JOY	PAUL SCHERER

ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton	W. E. McCulloch	Luther D. Reed
Angus Dun	Arthur Cushman	D. Elton Trueblood
Paul Bentley Kern	McGiffert, Jr.	Gregory Vlastos
John Alexander Mackay	Robert Hastings Nichols	Leslie D. Weatherhead
Earl Bowman Marlatt	Richard Campbell Raines	Luther A. Weigle

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Martin Luther's Faith.....	Wilhelm Pauck 3
"Though I Walk Through the Valley".....	Harland W. Wilson 12
Verum aut Bonum.....	Robert E. Cushman 25
The United Church of Canada Comes of Age..	Randolph Carleton Chalmers 34
The Christ Image in the Novels of Dostoevsky.....	Carl E. Purinton 42 ✓
Values in the Vulgate.....	Arthur Wentworth Hewitt 55
Where Are Our Adolescents?.....	William Hubben 71
From "For the Time Being".....	W. H. Auden 83
The Promise of His Coming.....	Raymond F. Smith 84
Edinburgh, 1901.....	Paul D. Moody 97
The Present-Day Task of a Theological Seminary...	Norman Victor Hope 113
Blueprint for Seminary.....	Clarence Seidenspinner 121
"A Treatise on Christian Liberty"—A Theological Reprint	
	Martin Luther 128
A Review of the Quarter's Fiction.....	John C. Schroeder 130
Book Reviews.....	135

Copyright, 1946, by Stone and Pierce. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Borden P. Bowne Fund

Bound March 1948

Who's Who?

5023

RANDOLPH CARLETON CHALMERS, B.A., B.D., Th.D. Associate Secretary, Board of Evangelism and Social Service, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN, B.D., Ph.D. Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, Duke Divinity School, Durham, North Carolina.

ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT, D.D. Pastor of the Methodist Church, Northfield, Vermont.

NORMAN V. HOPE, M.A., B.D., Ph.D. Archibald Alexander Professor of Church History, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

WILLIAM HUBBEN. Director of Religious Interests, George School, George School, Pennsylvania, and Editor of the *Friends Intelligencer*, Philadelphia.

PAUL D. MOODY, B.A., D.D. Cuttingsville, Vermont.

WILHELM PAUCK, D.Th. Professor of Historical Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

CARL E. PURINTON, Ph.D. Professor of Religion, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

JOHN C. SCHROEDER, D.D., LL.D. Master of Calhoun College and Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER, B.S., B.D., D.D. Minister of the First Methodist Church, Racine, Wisconsin, and Lecturer in Contemporary Literature, Garrett Biblical Institute, Chicago, Illinois.

RAYMOND F. SMITH, B.S., B.D. Pastor of the Middle Street Baptist Church, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

HARLAND W. WILSON. A former chaplain, Mr. Wilson now lives in Durban, Natal, South Africa.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press at 75 cents per copy. Annual subscription, \$3.00 per year in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents additional. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by the Epworth Press, 25-26 City Road, London, E. C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and sixpence per year.

Publication office, 210 Broadway, Nashville 2, Tennessee. Editorial and General office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York. Entered as Second Class Matter, January 16, 1932, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

205
R 279
v. 16

Martin Luther's Faith*

WILHELM PAUCK

*The great Reformer's writings show the prophetic tension of
a dynamic faith—Dr. Pauck indicates Luther's
vivid sense of the sovereignty of God.*

IN HIS SERMON on the occasion of Luther's burial on February 22, 1546, Bugenhagen characterized the reformer, his long-time friend and colleague, with the following words: ". . . he was without doubt the angel of which the Apocalypse speaks in Chapter XIV: 'And I saw an angel flying through the midst of heaven, who had an eternal gospel to preach,' . . . the angel who says: 'Fear God, and give glory to him!' These are the two articles of the teaching of Martin Luther, the law and the gospel, by which the whole Scripture is opened and Christ made known as our righteousness and eternal life."¹

Luther—an angel of God! Such a description suggests that his contemporaries understood his person and work in a religious sense. They regarded him as a prophet.

I

Luther himself thought of himself and of his work in the same way. He did not wish to be called a prophet (only once² he spoke of himself as "the prophet of the Germans," but he had the sense of a *divine mission*. In opposition to the defenders of the old faith who called him a heretic, he thought of himself as an "*ecclesiasticus* (churchman) by the grace of God."³ God had called him, he felt, to use his office of "Doctor of the Holy Scripture" for the reformation of the church according to the gospel. So he wrote: "I have received my doctrine by the grace of God from heaven, and, what is more, I have kept it in the presence of one who can do more with his little finger than a thousand popes, kings, princes, and *doctores* could do."⁴ In the same spirit, he once described his mission in the following Pauline way: "If I should want

*This article was written in commemoration of Luther's death which occurred 400 years ago, on February 18, 1546.

¹ Ernst Wolf, *Martin Luther* (Theologische Existenz heute. Heft 6). Munich, 1934, 7.

² 30, III: 290, 28. (All quotations are translated by the author of this article from the volumes of the *Weimar Edition* of Luther's works. The quotations taken from the Table Talk (*Tischreden*) are indicated by the sign T.R.; those taken from the Letters, by the sign B (*Briefe*).

³ 10, II: 105, 17.

⁴ 10, II: 228, 27.

to boast, I should glory in God that I am one of the apostles and evangelists in German lands, even though the devil and all his bishops and tyrants do not want me to be such; for I know that by the grace of God I have taught and still teach faith and truth."⁵ Such high claims he justified with the certainty that he was speaking "Christ's word" and not his own. Therefore, he did not hesitate to conclude: "So my mouth must be his whose words it speaks."

Because he knew himself to be an instrument of God and because he felt "more acted upon than acting,"⁶ he argued that the whole cause of the Reformation could not be measured by human norms. When in his old age he looked back upon the beginnings of the Reformation and contemplated "the very great, heavy care and trouble" which the work of the Reformation had cost him, he exclaimed: "Had I known all in advance, God would have been put to great trouble to bring me to it."⁷ Remembering the days of the Diet of Worms, he pondered: "Truly God can drive one mad; I do not know whether now I could be so daring."⁸ However, in the midst of the crisis of his trial, he had written: "The die was cast; and so I did not want to do anything else than what I did. I began to put all my trust upon the Spirit who does not carry on a lazy business."⁹ Thus he explained that all that took place at the height of the Reformation, occurred not because he had planned it so but by "divine counsel."¹⁰

This feeling of being divinely led he expressed best in the following characteristic words: "God has led me on as if I were a horse and he put blinkers on me that I could not see who came running up upon me. . . . A good deed rarely issues from planning wisdom and cleverness; it must all happen in the vagaries of ignorance."¹¹

These descriptions of the feeling of being called to a work that he had not chosen for himself are all the more impressive because Luther did not derive any pretensions of personal authority from his sense of mission. He did not wish his own special gifts and abilities to be regarded as extraordinary or authoritative. He resented it that his opponents called his teaching "Lutheran," and he got no satisfaction from the fact that his followers called themselves by his name. "Who is this

⁵ 8: 683, 13.

⁶ B. II: 39.

⁷ T.R. I: 42, 17.

⁸ T.R. V: No. 5342 b.

⁹ 6: 157.

¹⁰ T.R. IV: No. 3944.

¹¹ E.A. (*Erlangen Edition*) 57: 31f.

Luther?" he wrote. "My teaching is not my own, and I have not been crucified for the sake of anyone. . . . Why should it happen to me, miserable, stinking bag of worms that I am, that the children of Christ should be called by my insignificant name? . . . I am and will be nobody's master. With the one church I have in common the teaching of Christ who alone is our master."¹²

When, on one occasion, he wrote: "So say I, Dr. Martin Luther, the unworthy evangelist of our Lord Jesus,"¹³ he desired to appeal to the authority of Christ who alone, according to his opinion, should be heard as a prophet.¹⁴ But at the same time, he wished to be taken seriously in his judgment of himself as an unworthy servant of Christ. He dared to appeal with certainty to God's word, but he also confessed frankly that Christian obedience was a daily task for him and the cause of never-ending efforts. That is why he did not want to justify his right to speak in the name of God by his own Christian attainments. "Let everyone," he wrote, "be responsible for his own feelings. As for me, I regard myself as a Christian. Nevertheless, I know how difficult it has been for me, and still is, to apprehend and to keep this cornerstone (Christ). But they certainly do me wrong (who call me a Lutheran), for—God strengthen me!—I am a small, poor Lutheran!"¹⁵

No one understands Luther who does not pay attention to the two aspects of his sense of calling; namely, on the one hand, the assertion of being held and supported by God, and, on the other hand, the rejection of any personal worth and authority.

II

His *faith* corresponded wholly to the spirit which guided him in his work.

His deepest convictions were determined by his conception of God. God, as he saw him, was the restlessly working, driving power in all that is, the ever-active, creative livingness which lets no creature rest still. God is at work everywhere and in all, also in the godless, even in the devil.¹⁶ The whole universe is his "masquerade in which he hides himself while he rules the world so strangely by making a hubbub."¹⁷ The almighty power of God is nowhere and yet everywhere. Because it moves

¹² 8: 685, 6.

¹³ 30, III: 366, 8.

¹⁴ T.R. V: No. 6409.

¹⁵ 31, I: 174, 26.

¹⁶ 18: 709, 21.

¹⁷ 15: 709, 21.

everything, it is immanent in all; but because it creates everything, it transcends all.

It must be present at all places, even in the smallest leaf of a flower. The reason is this: It is God who creates, works, and preserves all things by his almighty power and by his right hand, as we confess in the creed. He sends out no delegates or angels when he creates and preserves, but everything is the working of his own divine power. But if he is the creator and preserver, he himself must be present, creating and preserving his creature in its most inward and most outward being. That is why he himself is in the very inwardness and in the very outwardness of every creature, from end to end, below and above it, before and behind it. Nothing can be more present and be more really within all creatures than God himself is.¹⁸

God is smaller than anything small, bigger than anything big, shorter than anything short, longer than anything long, broader than anything broad, slimmer than anything slim, and so on; he is an inexpressible being, above and beyond all that one can name or think.¹⁹

This all-comprehending, all-penetrating creativity is the fountain and spring of all life and of all good. It is closer to every one of us than any of us are to each other.²⁰ As it is God's nature to create all from nothing, so he is able "to help the forsaken ones, to justify sinners, to resurrect the dead, and to save the damned."²¹

He is the life of every being. He determines everything. He is present everywhere. But he is impenetrable and inscrutable. In such a way Luther spoke of God—most articulately in his book against Erasmus, *Of the Bondage of the Will*, and in his treatises on the Lord's Supper, called forth by his controversy with Zwingli. There he disclosed his profoundest thoughts of the creative power by which he felt himself driven and overcome. But he had still more to say.

It makes a difference whether you say that God is present or whether you say that he is present for you. But he is there for you, when he adds his word (to his presence) and binds himself, saying: Here you shall find me. When you have the word, you can grasp him and have him and say: Now I have thee, as thou sayest. So it is with the right hand of God; it is everywhere, as no one can deny; but it is also nowhere; therefore you cannot apprehend it anywhere unless it binds and confines itself for your benefit to one place. This happens when it moves and dwells in the humanity of Christ. There you will most certainly find it. Otherwise you must run through all creation from end to end, groping and fumbling about, here and there, without finding it. Although it is really there—it is not there for you.²²

In Christ the mysterious, inscrutable Lord of everything has made

¹⁸ 23: 133f.

¹⁹ 26: 339f.

¹⁹ 492, 12.

²⁰ 40, III: 154, 9.

²¹ 23: 151.

himself accessible. In him he is made comprehensible, because he has revealed himself in him without abandoning his mystery. He is hidden in the humbleness of the child in the manger. In the cross he is not *directly* visible as the victor over hell, death, and the devil. He is abscondite in the message of Christ about the mercy that seeks the sinner. And yet—"Whosoever does not apprehend this man born of Mary, simply cannot apprehend God; even if they should say that they believe in God, creator of heaven and earth, they believe really only in the idol of their heart, for outside of Christ there is no true God."²³ In Christ men have the "mirror of God's paternal heart." In him God is a God for them, their God. In Christ he is really the ever-renewing fountain of all good.

But men do not want to accept this teaching of God, for, so Luther argued, "Man by nature does not want God to be God; he would much rather that he himself were God and that God were not God."²⁴ Because of his self-sufficiency and selfishness, he is God's enemy. Though, when relying upon himself, he is driven from presumptuous security to despair in himself without being able to extricate himself from this dilemma, he refuses to acknowledge that he is a created being responsible to his creator. This unfaith is his sin. It is incomprehensible to him that he is a creature of God (this is proved by the fact that when he engages in worship, he tends to fashion an idol for himself); but it is utterly unfathomable for him that God should be a Father of sinners. His moral sense rebels against such a thought. If there is a God at all, so he thinks, God is the Lord of the righteous in whose sight only the worthy ones are acceptable.

Such is man's natural religiousness, according to Luther's opinion. Faith is its opposite. It is the acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and the belief in his accessibility in Christ and his word. Faith meant to Luther simply to have God. "Having a God," he wrote in the *Larger Catechism*, "is nothing else than heartily to believe and trust in him; . . . this trusting and believing makes both, God and idol; for these two belong together, faith and God."²⁵

This faith, Luther taught, must be seen as the personal act of the believer ("If you believe, you have,"²⁶ he repeated unceasingly), but he knew also that it is the work of the Holy Spirit and as such a gift of God. Faith can therefore be an event only if the Christian becomes

²³ 40, III: 56.

²⁴ I: 225, I.

²⁵ 30, I: 28.

²⁶ 18: 709.

a new person. It is Christ who forms this new person. "I do not live in my own person, but Christ lives within me. To be sure, I live as a person but not in myself or for my own person."²⁷ The person of the believer transcends itself, so to speak.²⁸ This was the experience of Luther's prophetic religion.

He tried to interpret this experience of faith in many ways, for all his thinking circled around it. "Faith," so he defined, "is the knowledge of things not seen; it is directed to things that are not apparent. In order that faith may occur, it is therefore necessary that all that is believed be hidden."²⁹

Faith is a miracle that cannot be understood according to ordinary criteria. Particularly when one has found God merciful, such faith appears as a blindly trusting audacity. "For this is the nature of faith that it dares trust in God's grace . . . faith does not require information, knowledge, or security, but a free surrender and joyful daring upon an unfelt, untried, unknown goodness."³⁰ From here Luther came to the remarkable conclusion that all certainty must be founded not upon human experience but upon divine revelation. "Our theology is certain," he said, "because it places us outside of ourselves; I do not need to rely upon my conscience, my senses, and my doing, but I rely upon the divine promise and truth which never deceive."³¹

And yet—faith must be a personal experience in order to be valid. A Christian must have faith by virtue of a personal deed and decision. "You yourself must decide; your neck is at stake. Therefore unless God says to your own heart: This is God's word, you cannot comprehend it. . . . If you do not feel it, you do not have faith, but the word merely hangs in your ears and floats on your tongue as foam lies on the waters."³²

III

In what a terrific tension Luther held his faith! On the one hand, he viewed it with radical seriousness as the work and gift of God who acts upon man from without. On the other hand, he experienced it as a concrete personal decision and commitment. In contemplating this tension, one understands why religion was a perpetual crisis and an unceasing battle for Luther.

²⁷ 40, I: 546, 25.

²⁸ See Fritz Frey, *Luthers Glaubensbegriff*, Leipzig, 1939, 110.

²⁹ 40, I: 228, 15.

³⁰ 10, III: 3, 329.

³¹ 40, I: 589, 8.

³² 10, I: 2, 335f.

This is the meaning of the *tentationes*, the agonies of faith, into which he was drawn again and again. He experienced that the merciful God withdrew from him. He was overcome by doubts concerning his work, when he questioned whether he should have dared to upset age-old customs and traditions in the church. He felt that, in the light of the human need for security, the ambiguity of divine grace was unbearable. He then sensed the nearness of God not as love and consolation but as wrath and damnation. When such thoughts beset him, he felt that he was being attacked by the devil and thrown into a battle for his faith. He attributed such agonies to his psychological propensity to melancholy, but he knew also that he did not understand their true significance by such a psychological interpretation. Indeed, he held these agonies of faith to be unavoidable because he was aware that, from the viewpoint of ordinary human experience, faith was an impossibility.

He overcame these *Anfechtungen* (assaults), as he called them in his own tongue, by appealing to Christ and by relying upon the First Commandment: I am the Lord, thy God; thou shalt have no other gods before me. When he was free again and restored in the faith, he knew more definitely than ever before, that the inborn and acquired human certainties and safeguards are nothing ultimately sure and that man deceives himself when he pretends to possess certainty in himself. Thus these agonies appeared to him as a means by which the truth of faith, as a truth from beyond man's reach, was confirmed. A Christian, so he concluded, must be continually in the process of becoming. As he is a forgiven sinner who, despite being forgiven, again and again falls into the sin of unfaith, so he is thrown into agonies of faith until the end of his days in order to test his faith by being compelled to fight for it. So Luther could say of himself: "I did not learn my theology all at once; I have had to brood and ponder over it more and more deeply; my *tentationes* have brought me to it for only experience gives one the right to speak."³³

He once said that the greatest of these *tentationes* was to know of none at all;³⁴ for such an attitude appeared to him the height of self-deception. According to his opinion, it was an incontestable fact that every man has a bad conscience in spite of all the masks of self-confidence he wears, for at the bottom of his heart he knows himself to be in the wrong before God. Even though he rebels against the gospel

³³T.R. I: 203, 36.

³⁴T.R. I: 146, 12.

of the forgiveness of God, because faith in this gospel involves the surrender of his self and the undoing of his self-determination, he will nevertheless experience faith as a liberation not only from himself, but particularly from his bad conscience.

Luther best described the human situation which leads to the agony of faith in the following words in which the fright and terror by which one can be seized at the sound of a rustling leaf serve as the symbol of all proud insecurities from which one can be liberated alone by faith.

So it can happen that conscience feels all misfortune that befalls us as the wrath of God and that even a mere rustling leaf seems to be God's wrath. . . . There is nothing more worthless and more despised than a dry leaf that lies on the ground; worms crawl over it; it cannot ward off even the smallest speck of dust. . . . But there comes a time when its rustling will scare man and horse, spike and armour, kings and princes, the power of a whole army and even such spiteful and angry tyrants as cannot be scared either by the fear of hell or by God's wrath and judgment but only become still prouder and more hardened by such threats. Aren't we fine fellows? we do not fear God's anger but stand stiffly unmoved by it. But we can be scared and frightened by the anger of an impotent dry leaf, and the rustling of such a leaf can make the world too narrow for us and become a wrathful God to us.³⁵

IV

From this analysis of Luther's faith we can conclude that his interpretation of the Christian religion corresponded exactly to his conception of the meaning of his mission in the world. In his faith he related himself only to God in Christ and he did not base it upon the content of his experiences. With respect to his work he relied only upon the almighty Lord of history and not upon his own qualities of leadership, of which he did not think much anyway. In his faith as well as in his work as a reformer he really believed himself "more acted upon than acting." This way of thinking has nothing whatsoever to do with quietism, of which Luther has often been accused. Rather it is "prophetic"—through and through. This can be proved by the fact that Luther felt himself called to a most personal, active participation in the work which, as he believed, God performed in the world through him. It was God himself, the ever-active creative power, who, by means of the Reformation, made room in the world for his word, but Luther was drawn into this divine work with his whole person. He felt that God had overpowered him, but he did not think that he had thereby been

³⁵ 19: 226, 12,

drawn into a heteronomous servitude. He was moved rather to commit himself to him who had overpowered him and to co-operate with him. Such was Luther's own conception of his faith. His principles of action were: Do not rely on men, but trust in God. Do not fear men, but fear God. That is why Luther acted on the historical scene without special consideration of political and historical consequences. Whosoever wants "to help the cause of the gospel," he wrote in a letter to Wolfgang Capito,⁸⁶ must preach it without fear and regard of men, in order that "the free, pure, and plain truth" may assert itself by itself alone.

In explaining the beginnings and the course of the Reformation to the people of Wittenberg after his return from his exile in Wartburg castle, he said: "All I have done is to further, preach, and teach God's word; otherwise I have done nothing. So it happened that while I slept or while I had a glass of beer with my friend Philipp (Melanchthon) and Amsdorf, the papacy was so weakened as it never was before by the action of any prince or emperor. I have done nothing; the word has done and accomplished everything. . . . I let the word do its work."⁸⁷

These words sound quietistic and politically naïve, but they were spoken by one who, in the name of God, changed the course of history. What Luther meant to express was that his decisions and actions were motivated only by his concern to serve the word of God, and not by political calculations and predictions. By, and on account of, his faith, he became a reformer. His work, the Reformation, will live as long as this faith finds a response in the hearts of men.

⁸⁶ B. II: 430ff.

⁸⁷ 10, III: 18ff.

"Though I Walk Through the Valley"

HARLAND W. WILSON

*A chaplain shares with his men that long inner war which for
many follows outward war—here too he finds
the way to victory.*

THE SKIRL of the bagpipes—to some a noise of agony, to others the sound of inspiration and challenge—indicated the approach of the 3d Battalion Transvaal Scottish. It gave me a thrill to watch as it marched with the long, easy stride characteristic of a Scottish regiment. These were "my boys," for I had been appointed their chaplain. During the months of training I had learned to know many of them and understand them. I knew something of their family problems, their economic worries and apprehensions.

There was Harvey, who once showed me two letters, one from his foster mother and the other from his own mother. The latter was demanding, under threat of hell-fire punishment, the dependent's allowance. The boy stated that she had abandoned him many years ago and he had found refuge in the home of his foster mother. Naturally he had made out his allowance to the foster mother, and she was saving it for his return. I went to the local magistrate, sought his advice, and clarified the problem. The money is now being saved so that he will have, when he returns, a tidy little sum with which to set up housekeeping.

There marched Frank, married a few months before enlisting. He had purchased furniture on the installment plan. The furniture people, hearing that he had volunteered, demanded the return of the furniture as there appeared to be no assurance that the installments would be kept up. His lack of enthusiasm while training indicated the burden of his problem. I was able to present this matter to the proper quarters and the young wife was now protected.

There was Alan, who once came to me to help him out of a tangle. Toward the end of the training period he had celebrated at a farewell party rather freely and a disturbance had occurred. Dishes had been thrown around and some damage done. The boardinghouse keeper had him placed under arrest. This meant that he could not go with his unit. His wife approached me and desired to take the full blame. However, I was able to persuade the good lady of the boardinghouse to reconsider

the matter. She generously withdrew the charge on condition that the broken crockery be replaced. The young fellow profusely apologized and more than made good the damage incurred.

Now their training days were over. I was mighty proud of these fellows and fervently hoped that we would be able to see the show through together. But it was not to be. The regiment indeed marched on, the bagpipes still skirling, to conflict and victory—while I marched on into a hospital.

What brought me there is not so important to this story. Many, through this war, are finding themselves in a similar or even worse condition than mine and are facing desperate odds. For all these the real story begins here.

I

Hospital can be a frightening experience. From the open-air life of wide horizons, companionship, and worthwhileness, I was bundled into the narrowing confines of a military ward with not even one pin-up girl to break the monotony of the distempered walls. I tried to find out from the medicos and nurses just what I was facing, and all the replies I received were cheery and evasive. I could not know the seriousness of my condition.

After a very bad night I was moved into a small one-bed private ward, on the door of which was the forbidding sign painted in red letters, "SILENCE! NO VISITORS!" Of the next nine months, little can be said. It was a desperate battle of "touch and go." Later I was told that sometimes all that was left of me was my "Cheshire grin," though I confess that at times I had no inclination even to grin. On occasions I was given morphia injections to deaden the agony and for some time, oxygen. I can dimly remember that a chaplain, a doctor, and the matron would come in, have a look at me, and then walk out again without a word. I did not seem to care what happened to me. I was unable to do the simplest things for myself, not even clean my teeth. With shame I admit that I became very irritable over small, petty things.

I tried once unsuccessfully to feed myself; then I was notified that it was the doctor's orders that I must be fed. I remonstrated with the doctor and the nurses. The only reply was, "Now don't worry yourself, make yourself as comfortable as possible and rest all you can." I seemed to be battling in the dark. Folks do not always realize that patients have minds as well as bodies. They are interested in the bodies

but do not pay much attention or show any interest in the mental health of the patient. When I was given my injections I would ask, "Why?" "Because you need it," was the inevitable reply. After that I shut up, but my mind continued to go in circles. When I was given any new treatment and was tempted to ask "Why?" I would reply, in unison with the nurse, "Because you need it" or "Because it is good for you."

Great credit for my recovery is due to the prayers and quiet confidence of my wife, the real heroine of this story. She never gave up hope, even on the occasion when the chaplain tried to comfort her, preparing for the end. I was at a base hospital and my wife was able to come. Day after day she would just sit and watch and wait. I was conscious of her presence, though often not a word would be spoken. Two of my friends once looked in and said, "Well, that's the last time we shall see the Padre." But through it all my wife's faith never wavered.

I still feel that sufficient information could have been given me in such a way as to permit me at least a better chance of fighting, so that the mysterious unknown would not have held such horrors for me. It might have saved me from the wasteful thrashing around, and I am convinced that I would have co-operated more happily than I did. However, I confess that I was a difficult patient, and the nurses were trumps.

When I became somewhat stronger I was moved back to the general ward. I was now a stranger, for all the old pals had moved out back to the line. Up to now my thinking had been very hazy. Now I was determined to think this matter through. I was not yet willing to accept the fate of invalidism. How could I meet it adequately? Could I form some philosophy of life that would stabilize me? Was there anything in the religion I professed and preached that could undergird me at such a time as this? Or was religion a "dope" for comfortable old folk? If I was to be useless the rest of my life, why did I not quit and give up or get myself killed outright? Then there was my lifework for which I had spent many years in preparation. I had just gotten nicely started when I enlisted. Would I be able still to do some worth-while task?

I soon learned that the others were thinking likewise. As they lay day after day with improvement so slight as to be unnoticeable, they likewise wondered "why." There was Herbert on the other side of the ward, to whom this question came with great bitterness. He had desired to break off his engagement. Why should he marry when he could not consummate a marriage and become a father? His entire body

was burned as a result of the explosion of a petrol dump. His whole body was swathed in bandages with a break for his mouth. But the grand young lady refused to discuss the matter; his first job was to get better and return to her.

Then there was Desmond, who was almost completely paralyzed as a result of a dread Oriental germ. At first he could do absolutely nothing for himself. He reached the very depths of despair. Then one day he decided to learn shorthand, of all things. The grim determination with which he forced his hands to move in order to make the necessary marks was touching and heroic. Of such stuff are heroes made. When he was finally transferred to England he was able to write a sentence in shorthand, though at a pathetically slow speed. He had to teach his left hand to hold the pad steadily and then his right hand to approach the pad. I have seen perspiration break out upon his hands and face as he quietly and steadily taught his two hands to act in conformity to his will.

Often the thought remained unspoken. Gradually we would allow ourselves to become torpid and dull until we just did not care a hang whether we ever got better or not. Yet all the time the question "why?" remained. We would tire out the visitors and chaplains who came, but none could give an adequate answer that satisfied our minds. How the nurses put up with our irritable pettiness was nothing short of amazing. But it was a passing phase.

Some of the dear old visitors would unconsciously create amusement, however glum we might be, when they gave us advice as to what to do and what to eat. The advice ranged from eating nutmeg, dates, raisins, and even garlic to some of the most absurd things such as lying on the right side at the time of the new moon. They were really serious about it, which made it all the more amusing. However, we were ever so polite and thanked them kindly. After they had gone, chuckles would be heard from the various ones to whom advice had been given, and we would exchange such advices. At least they caused a bright spot in monotonous days.

These dear old ladies visited because they wanted to and they soon endeared themselves to the boys. How different were those who came round from a sense of duty! One man came at stated times, who, I am sure, did not like to visit hospitals, though he appeared as a jovial sort of hail-fellow-well-met. He made heavy and often desperate efforts

to produce hearty laughter. Some of them were poor stuff indeed. And he would become annoyed if there was not a real response to his jokes. He did not seem to realize that there were times when laughing was almost impossible. To add to the discomfort, he would stand at the foot of the bed, usually leaning against it, and every time he moved or laughed he would shake the bed and jar the patient. To me it was hellish torture. He was eventually requested to keep clear of patients' beds and subdue his laughter.

Women came who represented some religious sect. They would approach each patient, whether he was asleep or not, and present each one with a tract accompanied with a word or question. However well intentioned they might be, they were not always considerate and sometimes annoyed a patient when he was trying to catch up on sleep after a very restless night. On one occasion, after I was permitted to leave my bed in a wheel chair, such a woman spoke to a patient and received a response that was evidently very devastating. She beat a hasty retreat, asking, "Is that poor man a Russian?" What he had actually mumbled was "What the b . . . -damn-hell." The next time I passed down the ward in my wheel chair, I asked with a big grin, "Are you Russian?" The boys near by thought it was a huge joke. He motioned to me, saying, "Padre, why can't them dames leave us alone? You know what a tough time some of us fellows have at night. We are so tired that we try to snatch a couple of winks during the day, only to hear someone asking. 'Are you prepared to die?'" We then had a good chat about his "wife and kids" at home in England.

II

After I had been in the hospital for over a year, Occupational Therapy in the form of rug making, tapestry, embroidery, etc., was started. This was really a novelty. At first the fellows sheepishly refused to have anything to do with any "female occupation." But I accepted, just for the fun of the thing. And as I was being taught, others would look on and chaff me with good-natured jests. I soon caught on to the knack and now boast some dozen pieces which I consider fine artistic work. It was not long before some of the others tried their hand, I became an unofficial instructor, and some were able to do better work than I.

Godfrey was suffering from "shell shock." He mooned around de-

claring that he ought to be receiving special care and treatment. He complained of various disorders which demanded constant attention from the nurses. The light over his bed had to be on day and night. When asked to do some little task for himself, his fingers became paralyzed. His legs were likewise affected, though he always seemed to be able to go to the washroom when he thought no one was looking. One day I had a hunch. At this time I was working on a design of a regimental badge that happened to be similar to his. I would ask him how the thistle on the badge was shaped, or the design of the motto, then would make terrible blunders. He seemed at times to show some interest, though often it revealed itself only in impatience at my stupidity and he would say, "No, it goes that way." Finally in exasperation he said, "Here, let me show you how it goes." And before he realized what had happened, he was absorbed in the work which involved finger exercise. He forgot that his fingers were paralyzed. Then there was the soldier who had both arms shot off. He learned to paint, holding the brush between his toes, and did some really good work.

Stanley was being prepared for a different and delicate operation. I had discovered that, though the boys could take it "Up North," riding a "trolley" to the operation room was another matter altogether. This young lad was scared; in response to my question he looked at me, white-faced and thin-lipped. Speaking to a patient in the course of preparation was not encouraged, for he must not be excited in any way. But it did not need an expert to realize that fear was taking a firm grip upon him from which he could find no release. To help him give voice to his fears, I asked, "Why?" "I don't just exactly know," he replied. "I should not be afraid, for my Dad and Mum are praying Christians and attend church. I wouldn't be surprised if they are praying for me right now." A pause. "I ought to know better, you see. I was a Sunday-school teacher. I can still remember the last lesson I taught. It was Palm Sunday and the lesson was about the Crucifixion. Funny how you can remember things. I remember how it bothered me because I could not explain what was meant by the attraction of the Cross. I have thought about it a good bit since then."

I then said, "You know the attraction of the Cross holds good now as it ever did. Why not center your mind upon the attraction of the Cross as it appeals to you? Don't fight, but let yourself go, knowing that the Cross will not fail you now." There was another long pause

as he thought this over. He smiled as he said, "I never thought of it just that way before." Pause. "Will you say a prayer for me?" So I prayed for the spirit of quietness and the sense of God's presence and for the undergirding power of the Cross, concluding with the words "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength." Though the days that followed were critical, he was able to prove the assurance of God's promise. When the screens that shielded his bed were moved a little so that I could see him, weak as he was, he could still smile and make the mark of the Cross with his finger on the blanket.

My bed gradually assumed the position of an observation post. I began to see things I had never noticed before. As I watched from my bed, I came to realize that it was the sense of the unknown that aroused fear. "If it were possible to bring that fear into the open," I asked myself, "would it not tend to disappear?" I saw men who were quietly fighting the fear of loneliness or failure or death. It was pathetic to note the heroic desperation as they attempted to screw up their courage to the sticking-point. To tell such a man to "snap out of it," or "forget it," or "don't worry" actually does more harm than good. In spite of any assurance he might receive, he knows that something is definitely wrong. But he does not want to own up that he is "licked," so he continues to take further punishment and the fear becomes deeper seated than ever. At the same time he attempts to peer through the mist, but all he is aware of is the instability about him and he begins to sink beneath the troubled waters.

The patient wants something more solid than a few lightly spoken words. During my crisis I was sustained by an experience which had its origin in an occurrence many years ago. My parents usually spent their occasional vacation at a rather lonely spot on the seashore. My brother and I slept in a room some distance from that of our parents. Just before my father retired, it was his custom to take the lamp and look around outside to see if we had left anything and to bring it in. One night I woke up to see what I thought were "fire fishes" on their way to gobble me up. What was actually happening was that the light from the lantern shone through the bushes and leaves onto the ceiling of our bedroom which was made of corrugated iron, thus making the peculiar-shaped fishes. I remember trying to pray, but when I looked up again they were nearer than before. In sheer fright I called out, "Daddy! Daddy!" My father came running in, saying, "What scared

you, my son? Daddy's here." As I now faced the critical moment in my life, out of the shadows came the question, "Why are ye fearful? Lo, I am with you always." This was the assurance that sustained me. Then I was able to face the crisis unafraid.

I saw that another problem was that of loneliness. I missed the comradeship of the boys, the active participation of my profession. But turning my attention outward, I realized the intense suffering of those who faced this problem. As the visitors came into the ward, some of the patients watched with longing, anxious eyes for someone to say "hello" to them, someone who would pass the time of day and ask after them, someone who would make them realize that they were not among the forgotten men. Anticipation died, hope faded to despair, and bitterness and cynicism crept in instead. They might put up a bluff front and act tough as though they didn't care. They tried to swallow that hard lump in the throat, or buried their heads under the blankets and sobbed. A young merchant marine was brought in. He was indeed a stranger in a strange land. He became desperately lonely and during visiting hours he would turn his face away as the tears trickled down his cheeks. I was asked to see him, and learned that he was Welsh. I was able to invite a young Welsh family whom I knew before the war to come and visit this young lad. The change in him was nothing short of amazing. He was meeting someone from home.

It seems axiomatic that few things are more demoralizing than the sense of insecurity. This was the next problem I had to solve. The question, "What is going to happen to me now?" was constantly on my mind. Like some of these boys, I would not be able to take my full share of normal activity and the problem of unemployment became acute. This was before the Demobilization Plan existed, which offers every volunteer the opportunity of finding some form of employment suited to his physical condition and which has made provision for the training of men in various trades. In those days it did not help much to be told that "everything that can be done is being done." I knew how Charlie felt when he said, "Padre, what am I to do? I've no job to go back to and I have a wife and two children."

During those long days of much thinking, I learned that though I had faced the critical moments unafraid, the long, slow fight toward possible recovery troubled me. It meant that I had to learn other lessons. I wanted to get up and back to something worth while. There

were days when my interest in occupational therapy waned and reading, even of detective yarns and light fiction, became wearisome. But very gradually I accepted the philosophy that these days and weeks and months were a necessary preparation for something greater.

Then came the day when I was discharged from the Army as medically unfit, but not from the hospital. This meant the Army pay was to cease soon. Though I was informed of my pending discharge, I could learn nothing of what I was supposed to do. Was I to get a pension? What was to happen to my wife and children, if I received no pension? To these and other questions I could get no satisfactory reply, but was reminded that government communications and procedure were bound by the reddest of red tape. The hospital superintendent generously sent the family provisions sufficient for a couple of weeks. The regiment to which I belonged also heard of my situation and sent enough to meet the rent and light for one month. The fear of insecurity gnawed at my very vitals as I waited day after day for some official word to come through. My progress was definitely hindered at this time and my reaction to treatment slowed up. I was helpless and in turn raged and wept at my extreme weakness. My wife was compelled to go to the Governor-General's Fund for a loan to see us through the next month. Finally, by the end of that month I received word that I was on pension. I was not discharged from the hospital for another six months. And it was understood that my pension was temporary, subject to revision every year. There was no prospect of my resuming the work for which I had spent many years in preparation.

In the meantime I pursued my studies in Mental Hygiene and Psychology, guided by Dr. George K. Morlan, which helped me to turn my interest outward and to save me from self-pity and invalidism. This guided course has meant much to me. Inasmuch as the story of my state of insecurity is related by Dr. Morlan in his book, *How to Influence Yourself*,¹ I wish to add that there is a sequel, and it forms the conclusion of my story. The pension was now settled for another year. This gave me time to put out tentative feelers. I had been advised not to consider any work in a large church, as the responsibility would be too much for me. But all I wanted was to know once more the feeling of economic security, no matter how humble the task was! It was this uncertainty of the future that led to my emotional tension.

¹ Berkshire Press, East Chatham, N. Y., 1944.

The proverb, "A sorrow shared is a sorrow halved," works both ways. By winning the confidence of those about me I was able to aid some who were burdened with fears and make it possible for them to get "their suppressed thoughts out into the sunshine of human sympathy which is like opening an abscess."² It was great to see how others were helped even though I had not said a word but simply listened. Then I would be embarrassed because of their genuine appreciation for my assistance. But the load had lifted, and they went out to face life with greater confidence and courage. I was learning also to sublimate my own emotional tension into worth-while activities and am fully persuaded that I have been the gainer. So, with my own experience still fresh in my mind, I am able to give the assurance of God's love and care. I learned that even in the hour of insecurity it was helpful to be able to turn my attention from self to others, especially to Him who has never failed in the hour of crisis. Bitter, hard, and defeated men have gone away with a new faith and hope.

III

After about six weeks at home, I had a relapse and was forced to return to the hospital. The prospect of spending another lengthy period there was not a happy one. I had to face all the problems again. During this time I was able to read such books as Leslie D. Weatherhead's, *Why Do Men Suffer?*³ Wise's, *Religion in Illness and Health*,⁴ E. Stanley Jones's, *Christ and Human Suffering*,⁵ but somehow my mind was not able to grasp the message these had for me. It was also my custom to read a few verses from the New Testament at odd moments. One afternoon I read the fifteenth chapter of Paul's letter to the Romans and came to the thirteenth verse. I stopped reading. This verse gripped me as nothing else had done. A new light flooded my mind and suddenly all the pieces of my problem fitted together to complete the picture I had been trying to form. I had read this verse before, but discovered no deep meaning for myself. Now my faith, once groping in the dark, had finally found and taken hold on something really solid and steady. It gave me a new lease of hope as I read, "And now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Spirit."

² pp. 66f.

³ McClelland & Stewart, Ltd., Toronto, 1939.

⁴ Harper & Brothers, 1942.

⁵ Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1933.

Edmund Jacobson's *You Must Relax*,⁶ a book suggested by Dr. Morlan, arrived a few days later. I had been receiving bromides, then atropine, and finally belladonna. I had severe pain, which I thought was the result of some tension of the oesophagus; I was not told the cause. Every night at about 10:00 P.M. the pains would begin and sleep was impossible. I lay doubled up in agony. However, I followed the instructions in the art of relaxing as best I could. Though it took me some time to note the sensations to be observed, I became able to know the meaning of relaxation and found once more the restfulness of sound sleep. It seemed almost too good to be true. When I mentioned this experience to a medical officer, he was interested but skeptical and advised me to keep the belladonna mixture on hand so that it would be handy when the occasion arose. However, thus far I have not needed to use it. Sometimes I do wake up in the night all tense, but instead of taking the mixture, I relax instead and again fall asleep. At such times I think of those who are still suffering and offer a prayer on their behalf.

I left the hospital about thirty days later and now three years have passed. A proper perspective came with the realization that life was worth living after all. At least I have not asked the question "Why?" since that time. My whole thought-life seems to have been reoriented, and the studies which once were interesting now became absorbing. I felt a joy in the possibility of being needed again.

IV

I am now living in what might be called the second chapter of my life. Up to 1940 I had led a very active life; I was happy in building and developing a new church. Now I must remain very quiet, though I do help in the home. (Due to the high cost of living, my wife is working to augment our income.) I prepare most of the meals. I do what I can in the Sunday school, as counselor to the Young People's Society, and as guide to the leadership training class. I have also attempted, in a small way, to assist those who seek release from inner tensions. My experience has enabled me to clarify my own attitude and I believe that I have gained patience and understanding.

A certain businessman whom I had met in a former parish visited me. He had been advised by his physician to take a holiday, to get

⁶ Whittlesey House, 1942.

his mind off his business for awhile, and not to worry. For the past six months he had spent his time at various holiday resorts. But it was not travel or rest that he needed. He complained of pains in the chest. He had committed a wrong against his business partner, many years ago, in the early days of the business. As a result he was still profiting at his partner's expense. It was, as he said, "getting him down." He was now able to get it "off his chest" and clarify the problem. He made up his mind to do the right thing. The burden lifted and he walked out a happier man. His pains disappeared.

Then there was a man who complained that he had been snubbed and felt very hurt. He said, "I suppose you will tell me to pray about it." I replied, "Oh, no." "Well, can you help me? I know it is my pride." Indicating my own bed, I said, "Won't you lie down?" I had noticed that he kept drumming his fingers, scratching his nose, jerking his neck, crossing and recrossing his legs. I showed him what I had learned about relaxing. He was very surprised, yet co-operated willingly though with some degree of amusement. After a while the tension seemed to have eased, and we remained quiet for some time. I then saw that there appeared to be a struggle in his mind. Finally he blurted out with "I didn't mean to tell you this, but" He spoke of the bitter humiliation of his boyhood days, in which he had had to fight for what recognition he could get and then, more often than not, was laughed at for his pains. Words poured from his lips. I said nothing. Again we remained quiet. Then he asked me to pray. I replied, "I would rather you did." How that man prayed! To have added would have been to spoil it all. He walked out with a bounce in his step. Such experiences have encouraged me to continue as I am able.

I am still under constant medical attention and am still considered 100 per cent disabled. My future remains uncertain. What my ultimate task will be I do not know. But I am learning some very valuable lessons. I regret that I have been such a dull student. However, I have learned that forgiveness does remove the disintegrating burden of guilt; that a happy sense of the worthwhileness of life comes when I turn my eyes outward, whereas turning them inward had caused me to become self-centered, selfish, morbid, irritable, and lonely; that faith in a God of love is the antidote for corroding fears; and that quiet confidence in a God of hope makes for mental stability and a happy assurance in the purpose of the Eternal.

My story is told. It has not been easy for me to undress in public, for I have been only too conscious of my many weaknesses. It is written in the hope that others, who are now confronting desperate situations, may find something in what has been written that will assist them on the highroad to recovery. I realize that this story fairly bristles with the personal pronoun. I do not see how I could have written it otherwise. It may also appear as though all of my experiences have terminated successfully. But these may be likened to an iceberg; the results are only ten per cent visible and positive. The negative results remain unseen, nor do they see the light of day except in the privacy of my study where I examine them critically and prayerfully in an attempt to find the cause for apparent failures, so that I may learn to do better next time.

It is my fervent wish that in reading my story someone may find a spark of hope, comfort, and encouragement so that he, too, may win his way to a bright horizon.

Verum aut Bonum

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN

In modern times the scientific mind has adopted, adapted, but perverted the text: "The truth shall make you free." Dr.

Cushman forcefully analyzes the result.

CALL THIS what you will: a tract for the times, an essay in criticism, or a premature death notice to a passing era, it matters not. What it seeks to say is that the diagnosis of our spiritual sickness requires reference to four centuries of truth-seeking in which truth was defined without regard to the good, or in which truth was conceived as defining or comprehending the good in itself. It was a period of the primacy of the true over the good—a period in which the common mentality was becoming essentially *wertfrei* and the best minds occupied merely with finding out.

There is a word of Jesus in St. John's Gospel which science early employed to clothe itself in the trappings of legitimacy. It goes thus: "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:31-32). From the start, the scientific mind adopted the text as its most telling apology; but the conditional clause was left out: "*If ye abide in my word, ye shall know. . . .*" For several centuries men have abandoned the condition and turned the conclusion into an imperative: Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free!

This seemingly minor alteration was momentous, even fatal. In a measure, it signalized the passage from the medieval to the modern world, from revelation to reason, from wisdom to science, in short, from man dominated by the reality of God to man dominated by the insistency of his sensuous experience. In perverting the word of Jesus, men turned their backs upon their spiritual ground and gave notice that henceforth they would rest their salvation upon experimental knowledge and the control of nature. It is only recently that the perversion of the text has become apparent because its consequences have become perilous.

The heart of the matter is this: the alteration of the text really involved a novel conception of truth, a conception in which there was no place for the "word" in which Jesus called upon men to abide. Indeed,

there was no place for any word unless it had first been verified by the method of observation and experiment. Herein, perhaps, we have the essence of the modern spirit: the tyranny of a method which defines truth and knowledge so narrowly as to leave no room for wisdom. Thus it is that when Jesus says "the truth shall make you free," the Christian understands one thing, while science has understood something utterly different. It is past time to articulate the difference with bold strokes.

The scientific conception of truth is not too hard to come by. The worthy Francis Bacon stated it nakedly in the dawn of the age of science. Truth, said he, is to be sought in the light of nature and experience. Truth, moreover, is directly related to the method of obtaining it. Indeed, the method defines what truth is. Bacon offered a new way of discovery, "a new way of understanding, a way untried and unknown."¹ He was at pains to distinguish the method from all earlier and traditional modes of inquiry. It was the method of "induction"; and, said Bacon, "by successive steps, not interrupted or broken, we rise from particulars to lesser axioms; and then to middle axioms, one above the other; and last of all to the most general."² By contrast, natural philosophers of antiquity snatch "from experience a variety of common instances, neither duly ascertained nor diligently examined and weighed, and leave all the rest to meditation and agitation of wit."³ Even the honored Aristotle was at fault in his method, first forming a conclusion and then referring to experience to corroborate it.⁴

Bacon's "middle axioms" are to be understood as identical with *second causes* and distinguished from *final causes*. The science of nature goes no further than and concerns itself only with second causes. These may be isolated by a "process of exclusion." The process entails observation of all instances in which an event occurs or does not occur; and, by gradual elimination of nonefficacious factors, arrives at length at the "affirmation" of the truly causal factor.⁵

Bacon's method, therefore, lays bare those causes operative in nature which explain how an event occurs but explicitly ignores the question as

¹ *Novum Organum*. (*Works of Francis Bacon*, 1863), Vol. VIII, p. 62.

² *Ibid.*, p. 138.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 92. Bacon might have learned from Aristotle the place and function of hypotheses in scientific method, but Bacon was so fearful of man's imposition of his likeness upon nature that he makes knowledge almost completely a matter of receptivity.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 209. See also p. 99. The method of induction here described resembles closely what J. S. Mill was later to call the methods of "difference" and "residues."

to *why* it occurs. That is, Bacon excluded from the province of science the question of final causes, of purposes or meanings, and values. It was his opinion that "the final cause rather corrupts than advances the sciences, except such as have to do with human action."⁶ Aristotle's teleological interpretation of nature, according to which "nature does nothing in vain" and may be viewed under the aspect of purpose,⁷ was scornfully rejected by Bacon as a failure of man to submit to nature. The teleological interpretation of nature is an "Idol of the Tribe," by which the human understanding distorts "the nature of things by mingling its own nature with it."⁸

In Bacon's estimate, God does nothing in nature except by second causes, and these, taken in their complementariness, exhaust the truth of nature which science seeks. Bacon condemned the tendency of the human mind to press to finality in everything. Thus, "the human understanding, being unable to rest, still seeks something prior in the order of nature."⁹ The last link of the chain, Bacon allowed, may be joined to "the foot of Jupiter's chair."¹⁰ Nevertheless, the understanding cannot verify this fact by the method. And so it happens "that in struggling toward that which is further off, it falls back upon that which is nigh at hand; namely, final causes: which have relation clearly to the nature of man rather than to the nature of the universe. . . ."¹¹

The middle axioms, then, are enough. These are what man requires to gain power and dominion over nature. These are the "solid true and living axioms, on which depend the affairs and fortunes of men."¹² Never mind if the only environment man can *know* is to be regarded as utterly devoid of purpose and value! The very fact that this is true guarantees man's control over it. If it is an environment composed altogether of mechanical causes, it is to the same extent knowable and therefore controllable by man to his own ends. The mind of man must therefore submit itself to the environment. It must be "hung with weights, to keep it from leaping and flying."¹³

The truth that Bacon's method defined was the truth about nature. Employing the method, Bacon's avowed purpose was "to lay more firmly the foundations, and extend more widely the limits, of the power and

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

⁷ *De Anima*, 432, b 20.

⁸ *Novum Organum*, p. 77.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 81.

¹⁰ *Advancement of Learning*. (*Works*, Vol. VI), p. 96.

¹¹ *Novum Organum*, p. 81.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 138.

¹³ *Ibid.*

greatness of man."¹⁴ In his opinion "the true and lawful goal of the sciences" was simply that human life might be "endowed with new discoveries and powers."¹⁵ Through the exploitation of the knowledge of nature Bacon was assured that man could become a god to man.¹⁶ But the indispensable condition was that the mind submit itself to things.¹⁷ For the crux of the matter is that "Nature to be commanded must be obeyed."¹⁸

Thus, with sanguine enthusiasm, Bacon hailed the new age which would usher in what he called "the kingdom of man." It was the Eden from which man too long had been exiled, not by divine decree, but by human ignorance. But this exclusion of man from the kingdom need continue no longer, for Bacon had discovered the conditions of entrance. They were the methods of induction and experiment and the humbling of man before nature. Regarding the last condition, Bacon declared: ". . . entrance into the kingdom of man, founded on the sciences, is not much other than entrance into the kingdom of heaven, whereunto none may enter except as a little child."¹⁹

What, then, is *truth* in this conceiving? Why, it is what can be known by a certain kind of method—that of observation and experiment. And what is known by this kind of method? Bacon called it nature. But surely nature is not all and there is more to know than nature, the spirit of man protests. Ah, replies science, but we achieve certainty only by the method. Only the method affords us entrance into the kingdom of man. If we are to have knowledge, it must be by the method, and nature is the only proper object of the method.

Thus it comes about that what we know and all we can recognize as being is nature. This is the logic which conceived and brought forth philosophic naturalism. It was largely achieved by the tyranny of a method—a method that defined what men could know and, therefore, what could be, at least for men. To parody the words of John Keats:

Nature is truth, truth nature,—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

It is pretty clear that Francis Bacon and most thinkers of his tradi-

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 147.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 145.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 68.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99. Cf. *Of the Interpretation of Nature*. (*Works*, Vol. VI), p. 37.

tion are agreed that this is the truth which maketh free. This is the truth, one may surmise, that the builders had in mind when they had struck out in stone the perverted words of Jesus over the portal of the library of a State University—"Ye shall know the truth. . . ." There they are for every passer-by, boldly etched; and it comes to mind how neatly the saying serves two purposes: to obscure the real meaning of secular knowledge while tossing a crumb of condescension to the innocent religious among the taxpayers. It is possible that duplicity was not intentional. Many a modern is so ignorant of the sense of the text and so oblivious of any other truth than the truth of nature, that he could hardly be held accountable to St. John's real meaning. Why should he be expected to know what St. John meant by the Truth, that he meant the love of God held out to men for their illumination and redemption in Jesus Christ?

What sort of truth is this anyway? Certainly, it is not apprehended or verified by the method! Neither does it, apparently, facilitate man's entrance into "the kingdom of man." As to the kingdom of heaven, what dealings has a sensible man with that? Surely, it does not belong to nature; and we have knowledge only of nature! So it turns out, and quite in this fashion, men have exchanged the vision of God and the service of God for the vision of nature and the service of man. Now we have become humanitarians bent on serving man, protesting our righteousness, but protesting over much. Actually, we are all dreadfully afraid of one another—whether individuals or nations. Is it because none of us has the vision of God but only the vision of nature? Have we found a truth which somehow does not free, and a knowledge that does not save?

It does not save, because truth has been defined so narrowly as to leave no room for the good, or men have assumed that the good will follow from a knowledge of the truth. This might be so if the truth actually embraced more than the truth of nature. But the only truth permitted by the "method" was the truth of nature; and nature was nothing but the facts of the causal nexus constituting the world order. Bacon defined nature in such fashion as to make the good only an eccentric viewpoint of man, insisting that man must not look for purpose and value in nature. Submission to nature involved what has been called objectivity. Objectivity is a way of looking at nature while purposefully extruding all semblance of ends and meanings from it. It is the cautious refusal to impose man's image upon reality as unpardonable immodesty.

If nature is the truth, and if nature is all man can know, then, manifestly, the truth known has been defined in such a way as to exclude the good. In the absence of a good, which might be as objective as the truth of nature, men have been content to regard their desires as sufficient indices of the good. But where desires conflicted, no appeal was left but to "the power of the stronger."

Examples are not wanting to illustrate the inability of the truth of science, of *knowledge*, to embrace and generate the good or to illustrate the divorcement of the true from the good implied in the method. Recently one has come to hand which expresses the meaning of "pure science," science utterly immaculate, science pursued with impeccable regard for the truth of nature. On December 12, 1945, the press carried the story of the court conviction of the overseers of the Dachau concentration camp: "One physician, seventy-four-year-old Dr. Klaus Schilling, was accused of killing hundreds of inmates in malaria experiments. He had begged on the witness stand to be allowed to finish the paper work on the results which he claimed indicated an antimalaria vaccine."

Here surely is an instance of fidelity to truth—a man who sought only enough time to complete his researches into nature. With utter objectivity and devotion to the fruits of experiment, he set aside every merely human and subjective preference for good as against evil in order to add to the sum of human knowledge. Here is one who unflinchingly answered to the imperative, "ye shall know the truth," even if, like a god, he was obliged to ordain some to life and some to death. Here also is science at the absolute limit of objectivity, the objectivity which Bacon long ago advocated as requisite to the achievement of truth. This is the objectivity that regards all phenomena as merely object, while, at the same time, it excludes from the knowing process all considerations of "final causes," of good or evil, because the latter distort the pure knowing function. Here science has become utterly pure and, can one doubt, utterly diabolical?

No doubt there are some who will urge that this is not a fair analysis. They will point, possibly, to the plausible greater good that might come from the death of these hundreds in the discovery of an antimalaria vaccine. To speak so is unwittingly to have absorbed the philosophy here under attack. What mortal man knows enough to perpetrate evil that good may abound? None, except those whose confidence in reason to comprehend the total nexus of causality is so great that they arrogate to themselves the prerogatives of God. The doctrine

that the end justifies the means is valid, if valid at all, only for omniscience; and no man possesses that. To be sure, the giant evils of our time in their political embodiments derive from the human assumption of omniscience, from the assumption of the possibility of certainty and the accessibility of truth. And what follows is this: *that whoever knows all has the right to do all*. Totalitarianisms of every form assume this omniscience, and a substantial contribution to this error has been the assumption of scientific naturalism:

Nature is truth, truth nature,—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

Knowledge derives from submission to nature, said Bacon. The Nazi state seems to have supplied the conditions for making that submission total and abject. Perhaps it was because Nazism contrived to suppress the surviving vestiges of Christian conscience in Germany. The latter had always stood as a barrier to science becoming absolutely pure, that is, actualizing its own inner meaning. Science, in other words, could never attain to the fulfillment of its inner logic so long as scientists retained even the remnants of a Christian memory. When this was effaced or suppressed in the Nazi state, the undiluted meaning of the "method" was unveiled. Even the idealism in Bacon's conception of the kingdom of man, taken to be sure from the Christian ethic, was proved illusory. Man had become an enemy to man, rather than a god, in the pursuit of truth.

It comes to this, then: the method which was to introduce the kingdom of man, had within it, when unqualified by preference for good, the capacity to bring us into the kingdom of the devil. The Christian is obliged, however, to admit that Bacon was right, namely, that knowledge of nature was to be by way of submission to nature. The Christian will even hold that such submission is good up to a point—until it becomes idolatry. That is, until it substitutes the creature for the Creator, nature for God. But the fatality in modern intellectual history is this, that, as man submitted to nature, he tended progressively toward total independence of God. Thus, faith and reason, religion and culture shifted toward ultimate divorcement.

This divorcement meant a disjunction of the true from the Good, or, equally pernicious, the identification of the good with the true. The Christian will affirm, and the course of modern history seems to bear him out, that the Object of man's primary submission—which alone af-

fords him freedom and preservation in history or beyond history—is not nature but the Author of nature. And, further, the Christian will declare that, as nature cannot be known until it is submitted to, neither can God be known until God is submitted to.

The shrewd Bacon perceived well the conditions of entrance into the two kingdoms. The prerequisite in either case he saw to be man's self-humbling before given realities—nature, like God, must be allowed to speak. Man must cease having his say and imposing himself upon reality. This was the secular parallel to Luther's insistence that men must cease making God after the idols and imagination of their minds and give heed to God's self-revelation. With respect to Bacon, however, one has the impression that underneath his perceptiveness was a sly suspicion, nearing an assumption, that there was greater utility in submitting to nature than in submitting to God.²⁰ In later times the assumption was to become explicit; and recently it has come to its final testing.

Atomic energy has at last bludgeoned the modern mind into confronting the question whether the truth of nature has not outrun its utility. That this is so is suggested by a curious item which appeared a short time ago in the press. A group of scientists, whose skill and knowledge of the truth placed atomic power in the hands of men, called for a "miracle." They reasoned that this scientific achievement was so improbable, viewed in advance of its accomplishment, as to make its realization well-nigh miraculous. Then with what may be regarded as true naïveté, they continued: "We can see no reason why a similar miracle cannot be achieved in international relations."

Here we have it, all the philosophical simplicity and innocence of the practicing scientist and the rationalist. Here is the current assumption that man, like nature, is an object amenable to rational analysis and that, when his "factors" are known, control is possible. But now objectivity stumbles on a subjectivity that defies calculation, and reason is frustrated. Human affairs at length declare themselves to be other than of the order of physical events which knowledge can manipulate. But the epoch-ending significance of the declaration is this: science, which from the time of Galileo to our own, proceeded on the principle of excluding

²⁰ Perhaps Bacon's evaluation of "divine science" was about that expressed by Aristotle who said: "Accordingly, although all other sciences are more necessary than this, none is more excellent." *Meta.* I, ii, 14. However, since Bacon equated truth and utility (*Novum Organum*, p. 156), it would appear that theological knowledge must stand low in the order of truth.

man from the knowing relation in order to get objectivity and truth, has at last stumbled back upon man and the realm of the subject.

Science has discovered a truth which is so big that it is unprofitable. It is unprofitable, not because it is untrue, but because it is true and at the same time belongs to man. Science and scientific naturalism, which has found little room in reality for freedom and which has, wittingly or unwittingly, exalted the rational and the true over the good, has at last been driven by the logic of its own discoveries to acknowledge the existence of the nonrational, the not-true, and the indeterminable. The subject, unlike the object, is somehow not explicable or determinable in terms of what is. It seems to possess a baffling and inscrutable causality from within itself as a center of consciousness.

The discovery of the truth of atomic power is, therefore, not so much the dawn of a new age as it is the end of the age of scientific naturalism and historical optimism—whether this is presently understood or not. Man has pierced through the realm of nature only to arrive back at man—to rediscover himself, and with dread. The truth, which in the seventeenth century promised to make him free, now at length attained, fills man with fear of his own incalculable will. Man at last perceives anew what other ages understood, that the words of destiny, contrary to Bacon, are not truth or falsity but good or evil. For, now possessing a portion of God's knowledge, men perceive that they are not good enough to be God. Perhaps the myth of the Garden here unveils its inner meaning, showing why there is sin in man's aspiration to be like unto the gods.

The modern era is characterized by man's submission of his mind to nature in faithfulness to Bacon's admonition. Man has mastered nature by submitting his mind to nature, as Bacon promised; but men have not mastered themselves. Perhaps it is folly to suppose that man could ever master himself by himself. Self-mastery is self-assertion, and self-assertion is autonomy. And autonomy, contrary to Immanuel Kant, is lawlessness. Perhaps man can only master himself by being mastered—but there are only two masters. On the one hand, Nature or what is the truth. On the other hand, God or what ought to be, the Good, which is not but, nevertheless, is. In God alone can the mind of man rest in the good which also is the truth. But we have long since exchanged the vision of God for the vision of nature. Man is very close to being mastered by nature in mastering her, but any hope for the future of man depends upon a renewal of the vision of God.

The United Church of Canada Comes of Age*

RANDOLPH CARLETON CHALMERS

A Canadian leader reviews the brief but significant history of the United Church and formulates aims and hopes for its future.

IT IS altogether fitting that we should pause to consider on this birthday of the United Church of Canada the significance of the union which took place twenty-one years ago—its heritage, its accomplishments, and its future requirements.

Here in 1902 the General Conference of The Methodist Church convened and at the same time there gathered together the commissioners of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. The latter body sent a fraternal delegation consisting of the Moderator, Dr. G. Bryce, Principal Patrick of Manitoba College, and Dr. C. W. Gordon to carry their greetings to the Methodist Conference. Previously there had been co-operation between these two Canadian denominations on home mission matters, but it was on this occasion that the Presbyterian delegation made a strong plea for the two churches to combine forces in order to combat materialism and to promote the interests of the Kingdom of God in a larger way in Canada. It was from this year forward that negotiations began to take place, not only between the Methodist and Presbyterian but also the Congregational churches, which ultimately led to the formation of the United Church of Canada on June 10, 1925.

HERITAGE

It is well for us on this occasion to look to the rock from which we were hewn.

Our United Church has a threefold heritage which is depicted for us in the Great Seal of the United Church of Canada.

(1) *Presbyterianism*. The contribution of the Presbyterian Church to the United Church of Canada is represented in the symbol of the burning bush in our Great Seal, which tells of the undying flame of

*The substance of an address delivered before the Manitoba Conference of the United Church of Canada on June 10, 1946, the twenty-first anniversary of the formation of the United Church of Canada.

God's Spirit in the life of the church. When we think of the contribution of Presbyterianism, we are constrained to acknowledge with gratitude our indebtedness to men like John Calvin, who not only formulated the Presbyterian polity which for the most part still prevails in the United Church of Canada, but even more important the doctrines of Presbyterianism, most significant of which is the emphasis upon the sovereignty of God. Presbyterianism made for a strong and virile type of Christian character, one not easily swayed by the winds of skepticism or cynicism. Not only our church and the Presbyterian Church throughout the world, but the whole of Christendom is indebted to the Christian witness of men like Calvin, Knox, and others.

(2) *Congregationalism*. In our Great Seal the symbol of the open Bible speaks to us of the Congregational contribution to the United Church. John Robinson said to the Pilgrims at Leyden in 1620 that he "was very confident the Lord had more light and truth yet to break forth out of his Holy Word." Congregationalism, stemming from the Puritan tradition, has always upheld freedom within the Spirit, the right to think freely on theological matters, the right to act freely in church affairs. In these days when we have been thinking in terms of the Four Freedoms, it is well for us to recall that basic to all four is freedom of worship, and one of the reasons why we on this continent can act according to the dictates of our own conscience is because men of the Congregational tradition, together with others, have left to us a heritage of liberty. Moreover, as Professor Perry of Harvard has pointed out in his book, *Puritanism and Democracy*, we in North America cannot think of our democratic heritage apart from the great contribution of the Pilgrim Fathers.

(3) *Methodism*. The symbol of the descending dove in the Great Seal, representing the descent of the Spirit of God upon his church, brings before our minds the contribution of Methodism to the United Church of Canada. In the Methodist revival of the eighteenth century, Protestantism became once again a vital force in the life of England and of many other countries in the world. It began historically when a young Oxford graduate, John Wesley, "went very unwillingly" to a prayer meeting in Aldersgate Street, on May 24, 1738, where he heard "the reading of Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans"; and when a man was describing the "change which God works in the heart through faith in Christ," Wesley felt his "heart strangely warmed." He wrote:

"I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation and an assurance was given me, that he had taken away my sins, even mine, and saved me from the law of sin and death." Lecky, the historian, describes this event as an "epoch" in English history. The gospel of Christianity now became a flaming fire that spread everywhere through the efforts of Methodism. In evangelical zeal and moral endeavour, few have equalled, let alone surpassed, the efforts of the witnesses of Methodism to the things most surely believed among us.

Through such a threefold heritage we thankfully acknowledge that we have been blessed of God. The contribution of each of these branches of the Church of Christ to the United Church of Canada is a boon above measure and beyond price.

BIRTH

June 10, 1925, witnessed the coming into existence of a new emergent in the body of Christ. Church union in Canada attracted the attention of the Christian world. At that time nothing quite like it had occurred in any other land. That Calvinist and Arminian, for instance, could live together in peace within the one household of faith, was a tremendous achievement in twentieth-century Christianity. However, it was simply indicative of the fact that when people have the will to union, and when they are conscious of the need, as our forefathers were in this land, for spreading the gospel more effectively, they are led to take great risks for the cause of Christ. So the new church launched out on its notable mission, greatly daring.

As one glances over the history of the church union movement, two reasons for union stand out above all others. One was the fact that in a large country like Canada, which even yet in many sections is in the pioneering stage, there was no room for ecclesiastical competition if the interests of the Kingdom of God were to come first. Many of our church leaders felt the incongruity of the situation where, for instance, there were three or four small struggling churches in a community of a few hundred people, all preaching the same gospel, but not working together. So men and women of these three denominations—Presbyterian, Congregational, and Methodist—felt they must do something to overcome ecclesiastical competition, and while they had a great love for their denominational tradition they had a greater love for the extension of Christ's kingdom. The other reason for church union was the belief that Christianity itself should lead toward greater organic unity, es-

pecially among Protestant denominations, in order to manifest our oneness in faith and in fulfilment of our Lord's prayer "that they may be one."

CHILDHOOD AND ADOLESCENCE

The first few years of the United Church was a period of adjustment when there was considerable "creaking of machinery." In fact, our church was really experiencing something of the "growing pains" of youth. For instance, most presbyteries had considerable difficulty in trying to reconcile the "call" system of the Presbyterians with the "invitation" custom of the Methodists. The United Church endeavours to blend these two former plans for the settlement of ministers, and during the early years of our church's life it was not easy to make the necessary adjustment to the new plan. The little nucleus of the official board of the Methodist charge, which was accustomed to making the decision with respect to inviting a new minister every four years, now had to consider the wishes of the whole congregation. On the other hand, the Presbyterian call system was brought down to earth by Methodist influence and was made to appear less "angelic" in its reference.

Then, too, former Methodist charges had to adjust themselves to the establishment of a Session, having spiritual oversight of the congregation, while former Presbyterians were faced with the setting up of an official Board, which includes both the members of Session and the Board of Stewards or Managers, as well as a few other leaders in the life of the congregation. While the Basis of Union did not make these changes compulsory, it nevertheless has come about with the passing of time that the large majority of pastoral charges in the United Church have made the necessary transition to United Church polity.

Again, it was generally true that the Methodists supported generously the larger program of the whole denomination, while the church loyalty of the Presbyterians for the most part centered around the minister. Both these manifestations of commitment to the church's cause have commendable characteristics, but during the early years of the United Church they often led to a conflict of loyalties, though largely unconscious, in the minds of many church members. In this regard we can now see emerging a new synthesis, combining the better elements in both loyalties.

In spite of these "growing pains" this new Church-child developed greatly during its first twenty-one years and has made an incalculable

spiritual contribution to the life of Canada and the Kingdom of God. During these years Canada experienced not only the economic depression, in common with other countries, but in addition the Western Prairies passed through a period of drought which tested the moral and spiritual fibre of the people. Today we look back upon the years of drought with some measure of satisfaction from this point of view, that the United Church took a lead in supplying food and clothing to the needy people of the Prairies. More than one leader has pointed out that this contribution from United Church people to their fellow Canadians in a time of need has done a great deal for Canadian national unity.

During the years of childhood and adolescence our church manifested some characteristics which may be noted. There was a large spirit of tolerance and good will, especially toward sister communions of the Church of Christ. It may be said by some critics that such tolerance was so broad that it was flat and that it lacked a strong positive note. Nevertheless, the fact remains that during these years it was the United Church which, to a large extent, manifested the spirit of the ecumenical movement. We believe that this spirit still exists within our church and we shall continue to extend the right hand of fellowship to Christians of other folds.

Another characteristic of the period was a spirit of activism which European churchmen claim is typical of church life on this continent. Perhaps it could not be otherwise in a new church in a period of adjustment and we do not wish to deprecate the spirit of activism as such, for without it many things cannot be accomplished for the Kingdom of God on earth. However, some of this activism did not possess Christian motivation, its aims were sometimes vague, its purposes very often indefinite, perhaps at times only partly Christian. But this was true not only of our church but of Western Protestantism in general. In fact, it seemed to be a phase of liberalism in church life. What such activism lacked was a doctrinal basis and theological content which would give it Christian direction. We believe that today our church is more conscious of this need.

Another characteristic of the growing life of this youthful church was its willingness to experiment in new ways. Here again some critics may say that we went to excess with experimentation in some cases. But in a developing church, seeking for new methods to make an impact upon national life, many members felt that we had to try new means

to make Christ's name known in our nation. Furthermore, we hope that the United Church of Canada will not become just one more denomination with rigid rules and regulations, crushing the spontaneity of life and adverse to the unorthodox means sometimes employed by the Holy Spirit. In this matter as well as in others we trust that our church will not lose its zest of youthful enterprise.

MATURITY

On this the twenty-first birthday of the United Church, when we, so to speak, have reached the age of maturity and now go forth with the full vigor of adulthood, we must ask: what of tomorrow? In this connection many things could be mentioned, such as the future of the ecumenical movement in Canada and the recent conversations by the Anglicans and the United Church on the question of church co-operation. We might also spend time considering the prospects of our home mission work as well as the need of our overseas mission fields. However, it will be more important for us to discuss basic matters, and in this connection we wish to make some suggestions.

First, our church must, more than ever, "grow in grace." We have been a church emphasizing the extensive powers of our faith. We must still hold to this emphasis, but we must equally stress the intensive side of this faith. One of the primary requirements of Christians today is that they shall develop a more sensitive conscience on moral issues, and we believe one of the ways in which this can be done is by an emphasis on "the life of God in the soul of man." The Crusade for Christ and his Kingdom, inaugurated last year by our Moderator, leads us in this direction and we hope that this will continue for many years to come. There must be a deepening sense of fellowship in our church, not merely horizontally but also vertically. In fact, some are beginning to think that we need a new Puritanism, a breaking in of the Spirit of God upon us, akin to that of the seventeenth-century Puritan movement, minus its defects.

Second, our church needs to develop a sense of theological awareness. It is interesting to note that Dr. Paul Hutchinson in his book, *The New Leviathan*, in which he deals with the great menace of statism to the church and to democracy, calls upon the church to do some specific things to counteract this menace. Primary in importance, according to Dr. Hutchinson, is the development of theological thought. He writes:

First, there is needed renewed appreciation of the importance of the fact that the Church exists to proclaim the nature and the will of the Christian God. . . . The return to theology on the part of the Church is not a retreat from the battle. It is an advance toward the heart of the battle . . . if the Church does not know what it believes, how can it know where its faith is threatened? How can it know what to fight for, and what to fight against? ¹

An English writer recently said that once again Christians must not only outlive and outdie modern pagans, but must also outthink them. We can do this only by re-enthroning theology as the Queen of the Sciences. Moreover, our theology must be positive in its emphasis, for the day of merely being apologetic has long since passed. It must be Christ-centered and its roots must go deep into the Word of God. It must be related to the active work of the church, undergirding its life and worship, giving direction to evangelism and purpose to all efforts for social progress.

Third, our church must strike the redemptive note. Too often our gospel has been little more than that of the secularists. While secularism has some values, they are not autonomous or sufficient for salvation. In fact, by themselves they may become "enemies of the Cross of Christ." The world of secularism needs the redemptive spirit of Calvary. Yet we have often missed this distinctive Christian note in our church life. Christianity teaches that it is by the grace of God alone that we are saved, and not by human effort. To practice the golden rule is not enough. We can see the value of the golden rule only as we look upon all people as "brothers for whom Christ died." The Incarnation and the Atonement must be central in our witnessing. It is not by human might or man's power, neither is it by academic cleverness nor intellectual acumen that the Kingdom comes, but only as the Spirit of God works in the lives and hearts of dedicated personalities. We all desire peace in the world but as General MacArthur said, "It must be of the spirit if we are to serve the flesh." Modern man must face the fact of sin and overcome it. But he cannot overcome it himself. He needs redemption by a higher power. He needs Christ.

Civilization today is in danger of losing its soul. It is therefore the duty of the church to bring to the forefront of her preaching and teaching, her worship and witnessing, the "soul" qualities of the Kingdom of God which alone can sanctify human life. A prominent word

¹ Willett, Clark & Company, 1946, p. 227.

in this postwar world is "reconstruction." Let us remember that the soul of all reconstruction is the reconstruction of the soul.

Fourth, our church must appropriate the power of the risen Christ. The Great Seal of the United Church contains the Alpha and Omega of the Greek alphabet, symbolic of the Spirit of Christ in the life of the church. We believe that "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." His presence must be the living reality in our church's life to make it truly a part of the Body of Christ.

Yesterday we celebrated the Anniversary of Pentecost. Whitsuntide tells us that the eternal God is our contemporary and that the ever-living Christ comes into the dust of daily toil. A vital church should think of Pentecost as a normal kind of Christian experience in which the great values of the Christian tradition become a living reality to empower and to bless. It is for the coming of this Pentecostal grace, for the appropriation of Christ's Spirit in larger measure in our church's life, that we pray at this time.

As we view in retrospect the past twenty-one years in the life of the United Church of Canada we can truly say: "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad." As we look to the future may we, in expectant faith, lay hold of the promise that God "will show him greater works than these, that ye may marvel."

The Christ Image in the Novels of Dostoevsky

CARL E. PURINTON

Dr. Purinton describes Dostoevsky's character types and psychological insights, his vision of Christ, his way of individual and social salvation.

I

FYODOR DOSTOEVSKY was one of those whom William James labelled "twice-born" men. In August, 1880, the year before his death, Dostoevsky declared: "The people gave me back Christ, whom I learned to know in my father's house, but whom I lost later."¹

Dostoevsky's daughter, Aimée, in a study prepared for the centenary of her father's birth, describes him as growing up in a religious home. The parents went often to church and took their children with them. The readings from the Bible which Fyodor heard there impressed him deeply. The respect given to religion in the home and the example of faith demonstrated by the parents in periods of crisis inclined the children to take religion seriously. This is well illustrated in a memory of early childhood which always remained deeply imprinted upon Dostoevsky's mind. One evening, when the entire family was assembled in the Moscow home, the door of the drawing room was flung open and the steward of a country estate owned by the family burst in and announced dramatically: "The domain has been burned." Although the parents believed at the time that they were totally ruined, they did not give way to despair, but knelt humbly before the icons and prayed to God for strength to endure their misfortune. This and other memories of childhood suggest that there may be an autobiographical quality in the memorable passage toward the end of *The Brothers Karamazov*, where Dostoevsky has one of his characters say: "You must know there is nothing higher and stronger and more wholesome for life in the future than some good memory, especially a memory of childhood, of home."

Yet, as Dostoevsky himself indicates in the sentence already quoted, he had lost his childhood faith by the time of early manhood. Indeed,

¹ Aimée Dostoyevsky, *Fyodor Dostoyevsky*, Yale University Press, 1922, p. 1.

at the time of his arrest in 1849, he appears to have been an atheist. It is customary to minimize the extent of Dostoevsky's revolutionary (and atheistic) sympathies at the time of his arrest. E. J. Simmons, however, in his standard work, *Dostoevski, The Making of a Novelist*,² gives reasons for believing that Dostoevsky fully shared the materialistic and atheistic outlook of the revolutionary circle in which he moved at this time. On April 23, 1849, as part of the widespread reactionary movement over Europe following 1848, Dostoevsky and others were arrested, imprisoned, and later sent to Siberia. The revolutionary group with which Dostoevsky was connected was known as the Petrashevsky Circle. Dostoevsky was also a member of the inner seven known as the Durov Circle, which held views of an even more radical character. The leader of the Durov Circle was N. A. Speshnev, an atheist and communist, prototype of Stavrogin in *The Possessed*. Petrashevsky, leader of the whole movement, spoke of Christ as "a well-known demagogue who had ended his career somewhat unsuccessfully." It is reasonable to believe that Dostoevsky, as one of the more active participants in this revolutionary movement, shared the atheistic outlook of its leaders.

Years later, to a woman who had befriended him while he was in prison, Dostoevsky described his credo.

This credo is very simple. Here it is: to believe that there is nothing more beautiful, more profound, more sympathetic, more reasonable, more manly, and more perfect than Christ, and not only is there nothing, but, I tell myself with jealous love, there can be nothing. Besides, if anyone proved to me that Christ was outside the truth, and it *really* was so that the truth was outside Christ, then I should prefer to remain with Christ than with the truth.³

This is an abrupt reversal of Dostoevsky's pre-prison attitude. What accounts for the transformation?

The answer is that Dostoevsky's inner life was deepened by the shock and suffering he experienced. Later on Dostoevsky was to teach through his novels the profound truth that man's redemption is made possible through suffering. But first he had to learn that lesson for himself. His arrest, the passing of the death sentence upon him and his companions, and the dramatic manner in which the sentence was commuted to imprisonment only a few seconds before the execution was to have been carried out left a permanent mark upon Dostoevsky. There is a passage in *The Idiot* describing the emotions of a man led out for

² Oxford University Press, 1940, p. 63.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

execution. We may assume that this is based upon Dostoevsky's own experience. The group of condemned men were led out to the scaffold and the sentence of death read over them. Twenty paces from the scaffold were three posts stuck in the ground. Three prisoners were led up, bound to the posts, and white caps pulled over their eyes; several soldiers were placed opposite each post. Dostoevsky was eighth in the list and so would have been in the third group to be executed. A priest went from one to the next with a cross. Dostoevsky knew he had only five minutes to live. Then, at the last moment, a reprieve was announced and a different punishment prescribed. To be brought this close to eternity and then to be restored to earthly existence is enough to leave a lasting mark upon any man. In the case of Dostoevsky, the experience severely aggravated the epilepsy to which he was already subject.

The commutation of the death sentence was followed by four years of imprisonment at Omsk in Siberia, where Dostoevsky lived as an ordinary convict among murderers and thieves. In *The House of the Dead*, he describes his arrival at the prison house in the darkness of an early January evening just as the men were returning from work and getting ready for the roll call. Here he was to undergo experiences which he could never have imagined had he not actually been exposed to them. For example, "I could never have imagined," he wrote, "how terrible it would be, never once for a single minute to be alone for the ten years of my imprisonment. At work to be always with a guard, at home with two hundred fellow prisoners; not once, not once alone! Yet this was not the worst I had to get used to."

When the day's work ended and darkness came, the convicts were locked up for the night in the barracks, a long low room lighted only by tallow candles and full of a heavy smell. For sleeping quarters each prisoner had for himself three planks on a narrow platform. In the winter the prisoners were locked up early and it was four hours before there was quiet. "And before that—noise, uproar, laughter, swearing, the clank of chains, smoke and grime, shaven heads, branded faces, ragged clothes, everything defiled and degraded. What cannot man live through!"

During this period of imprisonment at Omsk the only book allowed Dostoevsky except for a period of illness at the prison hospital was the New Testament. His greatest consolation came to him through the

words of Christ. These four years as a convict have the greatest importance in Dostoevsky's religious as well as literary development. There and then the Christ Image became central to his life. Credit for this Dostoevsky assigns to the rough convicts who were his prison companions. They broadened and deepened his understanding of human nature. He came to see that the image of God exists to some degree in even the most depraved individual. It is this period to which the statement refers, already quoted in part: "I know our people. I have lived with them in prison, eaten with them, slept with them, worked with them. The people gave me back Christ, whom I learned to know in my father's house, but whom I lost later, when I in my turn became 'a European Liberal.'"⁴

Dostoevsky regained his freedom eventually. In 1854, after four years of imprisonment at Omsk as an ordinary convict, he was released from prison and transferred to a regiment of the line stationed in Siberia. He had to serve as a common soldier at first, but was later promoted to the rank and privileges of an officer. In 1859 he was allowed to resign from the army and after some months was permitted to fulfil his burning desire to live again in the capital, St. Petersburg, where he resumed his career as a writer and ventured as well into the field of literary and political journalism.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF HIS WRITING

The development of Dostoevsky's writing reflects his personal growth. *Poor Folk*, his first novel, was published in 1846, and has been described as marking the acme of the "philanthropic" literature of the forties in Russia. Dostoevsky is here simply the humanitarian, not the tragic novelist of his later period. This novel takes the form of letters exchanged between a poor, middle-aged, government clerk and a young girl. *Poor Folk* was succeeded by a dozen other stories and short novels, none of which attracted nearly as favorable attention as the first. Then for a period of ten years, Dostoevsky's publications ceased, perforce.

A quite different, a deeper, more mature note marks the writings of the period following Dostoevsky's return from imprisonment and exile to freedom. *The House of the Dead*, published in 1861, is based on Dostoevsky's prison experiences and had, incidentally, not a little to do with prison reform in Russia. *Notes from the Underground*, which ap-

⁴ Aimée Dostoevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

peared in 1864, marks the turning point of Dostoevsky's career as a novelist. According to Prince D. S. Mirsky, it reflects the transition from "the humanitarian idealist and dreamer of the early years to the tragic creator of his full maturity."⁵ Elsewhere, the same writer adds, we find in the most inspired passages of this later period "the profound Jobean and Promethean questioner whose only peers in modern times are Pascal and Nietzsche."⁶

The great novels of this mature period are four in number. *Crime and Punishment*, finished in 1866, is "the psychological account of a certain crime," as Dostoevsky described it. In it we meet two of his more famous characters, Raskolnikov and Sonia Marmeladova, among others. *The Idiot*, completed in 1868, portrays one of the most lovable and Christlike characters in all literature, Prince Myshkin. *The Possessed*, 1871, has been described as "a novel of terroristic conspiracy" and contains ominous forewarnings of what we have experienced as totalitarian excess. Publication of *The Brothers Karamazov* was begun in 1879 and completed in 1880. Whereas *Crime and Punishment* is frequently regarded in this country as Dostoevsky's greatest novel, first place in Russia is given to *The Brothers Karamazov*. Sigmund Freud called the latter book "the greatest novel ever written," a tribute due in this case, as A. Yarmolinsky has pointed out, not only to Dostoevsky's "literary achievement, but also to his unparalleled psychological intuitions."⁷

III. DOSTOEVSKY'S CHARACTERS

The heart of Dostoevsky's novels is to be found in the characters who live in their pages. The novels we are considering are ideological ones and the characters are, many of them, type-figures. Furthermore, they are extreme cases within their types, many of them distorted and even unbalanced. Yet in the hands of their artist-creator, they become living personalities, people that you seem to recognize among those you yourself have known, even like yourself in certain moods. As Yarmolinsky says in his little guide to *Russian Literature*, speaking of *The Brothers Karamazov*:

When you have put down the book and freed yourself from its peculiar spell, you may come to feel that these Karamazovs, the passionate women with

⁵ Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th Ed., "Dostoevski," p. 547.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 547.

⁷ *Russian Literature*, American Library Association (Chicago), 1931.

whom they are involved, the saintly monks to whom they confess their sins, their servants, the incidental figures who stray into their orbit, are alien and more than a little unreal. And yet in the end you are apt to recognize that they differ from ordinary people in degree rather than in kind. These impulsive, vehement men and women who go to extremes in everything are caught in the grip of lusts and ecstasies, loves and hatreds which strip them of all normal restraints. As a result, we are allowed to study the soul in all its nakedness.⁸

This is a viewpoint on the study of personality which William James would have approved. In the latter's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, he preached and practiced the view that it is legitimate to apply to normal personality lessons learned from a study of personality-types *in series*; i.e., we may learn much that applies to ordinary people from a study of extreme, even abnormal cases. If this be true, then there is much that we may learn about personality, its problems and its possibilities, from a reading of Dostoevsky's novels. Dostoevsky was a student of the depths of human psychology before the "depth psychology" that we know had been formulated.

1. *The Doubles*

The characters in these novels tend to fall into one or another of three types: "doubles," "meek," and "self-willed." The "double" was Dostoevsky's earliest creation and gave the title to the second novel written by him. The double is, of course, the divided personality, with which we are all too familiar in our own day. Modern conditions of life seem to have aggravated the tendency toward dissociation so acutely portrayed by Dostoevsky. Amos N. Wilder in his *Spiritual Aspects of the New Poetry* attributes this threat to the fullest development of responsible selfhood in our own day to the breaking down of what he calls the "organic unities" of man's life, his unity with nature, family, and society. This loss of unity has made many individuals rootless and given them a sense of frustration and futility, a note which recurs in modern poetry. T. S. Eliot, for example, describes modern men living incomplete individual lives in our large cities as "hollow men." W. H. Auden, in his recent Christmas oratorio, "For the Time Being," suggests that our age is one in which "darkness and snow descend on all personality," and stresses as a cause of this condition the "rootlessness" of our modern way of life. In his portrayal of "doubles," Dostoevsky thus treats of a condition very characteristic of our own time.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

Numerous doubles inhabit the pages of Dostoevsky's novels. Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment* and both Dimitri and Ivan Karamazov in *The Brothers Karamazov* represent this type of character. Raskolnikov is described as "alternating between two opposing characters." His motive for murdering the old pawn-broker he states at one moment in idealistic terms, as intended to help his mother and by completing his own education to prepare himself to benefit mankind. In the next moment, he admits that he committed the murder solely to satisfy a kind of Napoleon complex.

Dimitri demonstrates a striking ambivalence of the image of good and the image of evil. The resulting inner torment is eloquently attested by his own words:

I can't endure the thought that a man of lofty mind and heart begins with the ideal of the Madonna and ends with the ideal of Sodom. What's still more awful is that a man with the ideal of Sodom in his soul does not renounce the ideal of the Madonna, and his heart may be on fire with that ideal, genuinely on fire, just as in his days of youth and innocence . . . *God and the devil are fighting there and the battlefield is the heart of man* (italics mine).

Ivan's despair of finding a basic meaning in life impels him to vow his own destruction by suicide by the age of thirty. In the famous dialogue with Alyosha in the "stinking tavern," he declares:

If I didn't believe in life . . . lost faith in the order of things, were convinced in fact that everything is a disorderly, damnable, and perhaps devil-ridden chaos, if I were struck by every error of man's disillusionment—still I should want to live and, having once tasted of the cup, I would not turn away from it till I had drained it! At thirty, though, I shall be sure to leave the cup, even if I've not emptied it. . . .

2. *The Meek*

If the double is the basic type employed by Dostoevsky, the meek and the self-willed represent Dostoevsky's attempt to break down and portray separately the opposing elements commonly found in juxtaposition within a single personality. Examples of the meek or submissive type are Prince Myshkin in *The Idiot*, Sonia Marmeladova in *Crime and Punishment*, Alyosha and Father Zossima in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Some of the submissive characters, such as those listed, are shown in their own way to exercise such a moral and spiritual force that they become bearers of the Christ image.

While the meek play an important part in all of Dostoevsky's writings, a meek character becomes the hero of a novel for the first time in

The Idiot. Myshkin is described on the opening page of the book in language obviously suggestive of the Christ figure. He is a "young man, twenty-six or twenty-seven years old, above the average in height, with very fair thick hair, with sunken cheeks and a thin, pointed, almost white beard. His eyes (are) large, blue, and dreamy; there (is) something gentle . . . in their expression." One may find other resemblances to the gospel-portrait of Christ. Myshkin is fond of children, one time remarking, "The soul is healed by being with children." The girl, Marie, befriended by Myshkin, reminds one of Mary Magdalene.

The figure of Prince Myshkin is one of the most attractive in Dostoevsky's novels and embodies Dostoevsky's idea of the power of humble love to change sinful human nature. This thought is perhaps best expressed later on in the words of Zossima in *The Brothers Karamazov*: "Always decide to use humble love. If you resolve on that once for all, you may subdue the whole world. Loving humility is marvelously strong, the strongest of all things and there is nothing else like it."

Alyosha in *The Brothers Karamazov* is an incompletely developed example of the Christlike character. As Simmons suggests, it is likely that he was to become the hero of the epic novel which Dostoevsky planned and intended to call *The Life of a Great Sinner*, but which he never wrote. "Presumably he was to marry Liza, live through a period of sinning, during which he would come into contact with a variety of people, including revolutionary terrorists, and finally achieve salvation through suffering."⁹ Alyosha is described in the novel as a "well-grown, red-cheeked, clear-eyed lad of nineteen, radiant with health." In portraying his character, Dostoevsky was anxious not to overidealize him. He is described as not precocious and as not having finished his studies, although not stupid. He is fond of people, trusts them, never judges others nor criticizes them. When conditions in his father's house become unbearable, he simply withdraws without condemning his father. His forbearance even wins the brutish father to him. It will be seen how closely Dostoevsky hews to the line of the Sermon on the Mount in this characterization. Alyosha enters a monastery as a novice finding in that course "the ideal escape for his soul struggling from the darkness of worldly wickedness to the light of love." Dostoevsky,

⁹ E. J. Simmons, *op. cit.*, p. 349.

however, does not permit his hero to remain in the monastery. The Christlike figure is one who has himself been tempted, has experienced the sufferings of men living in the world. Thus the elder bids Alyosha to leave the monastery:

This is not your place for the time. I bless you for great service in the world. Yours will be a long pilgrimage You will have to bear *all* before you come back. There will be much to do You will see great sorrow, and in that sorrow you will be happy. This is my last message to you: in sorrow seek happiness. . . .

Zossima, the Russian monk of *The Brothers Karamazov*, is the most fully developed of any of the meek characters. On the basis of a study of Dostoevsky's notebooks, E. J. Simmons states that Dostoevsky spent a full two months upon the fifty pages devoted to the characterization of "The Russian Monk," the title given to Book VI of the novel, more in proportion than the time devoted to any other of the twelve books of the entire work. Although a meek character, Zossima has had much experience of life, including a dissolute period as an army officer. His conversion to religious faith is influenced by the emotional disturbance of a duelling experience in which Dostoevsky succeeds in a very difficult experiment, that of making an idealistic action seem convincing in a situation very similar to Saul Kane's fight in "The Everlasting Mercy," where Masfield resorts to the easier alternative of having his leading character submit to his lower impulses of fear and pride rather than to obey the higher. In these pages, Dostoevsky's own personal and social ideal is more fully developed than elsewhere. In a letter to the associate editor of *The Russian Messenger*, quoted by Simmons, Dostoevsky stated that he himself held the same opinions as those expressed by Zossima, but that "the manner of their presentation belongs to his character."¹⁰

3. *The Self-willed*

Especial attention should be paid to the third type of character, the self-willed. Dostoevsky's understanding of this class of human being was particularly enriched by his prison experience. Representative figures are Petrov and Orlov in the largely autobiographical *House of the Dead*. These self-willed characters embody the evil principle in man, although Dostoevsky remains true to his instinct as an artist and permits us to

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 376.

find some good even in these criminal types. Petrov he describes as "the most determined man in all the prison." Orlov, another convict, exemplified for Dostoevsky the complete control of will over flesh. He was a robber who had murdered old people and children in cold blood. In such men we find the predecessors of later personalities like Verkhovenski and Stavrogin.

The self-willed character is one of which Dostoevsky had made a special study. It is a type ill understood by the rest of the world until very recent years when awareness of it was forced upon our consciousness by the excesses of totalitarian oppression. It is the kind of personality labeled by Dostoevsky as the "underworld man" in his *Letters from the Underworld*. Berdyaev interprets the term by explaining that "the original has *podpolya* (from *pol*, floor, and *pod*, under), meaning the space between the floor and the ground or between a floor and the ceiling beneath. The word is associated with the idea of vermin breeding in the darkness and preparing destruction."¹¹ This self-willed, even criminal person carries the demand for freedom to the point where it becomes compulsion and tyranny for all but a master class and expresses itself in most extreme forms of cruelty. The ideal society aspired to by such men is called by Dostoevsky "Shigalovism," after Shigalov, one of the characters in *The Possessed*. It bears such startlingly close resemblance to the actual character of the totalitarian revolution that we have come to know in our day, that Dostoevsky has been called the prophet—in the sense of the forewarner—of totalitarianism.

Note the faithfulness of Dostoevsky's picture of this totalitarian society to authoritarian regimes of our own day. Shigalov has discovered equality, an equality achieved by reducing all things to their lowest common denominator. The level of education and science will be reduced. These things are for great intellectuals, and persons who stand out from the rest are not wanted, because they tend to disturb the equilibrium. "Cicero will have his tongue cut out, Copernicus will have his eyes put out, Shakespeare will be stoned—that's Shigalovism." The equality to be found in this totalitarian Utopia will be an equality of slaves. The attitude of the masters toward the masses will be one of cynical disbelief in the capacity of human beings to exercise freedom. "In the herd there is bound to be equality." No moral scruples are to impede the rulers in their control of society. They will make use of

¹¹ Nicholas Berdyaev, *Dostoevski*, Sheed and Ward, 1934, p. 50.

drunkenness, slander, spying, and corruption. It will be the duty of every member of society to spy upon others, even to inform against them. Concessions to the need of an emotional outlet will be provided. "Once in thirty years Shigalov would let them have a shock and they would all suddenly begin eating one another up, simply as a precaution against boredom." But with all these concessions there will be an iron-clad discipline. "The great thing will be discipline." So runs the account in *The Possessed*.

Those of us who live, so to speak, "after the deluge," will feel a twinge of conscience when we read in Dostoevsky that the responsibility for the state of affairs thus sketched will belong not only to the criminal, self-willed leadership, but also to those who stand passively by and do not actively oppose it. There are, for example, the teacher who laughs with children at their god, the lawyer who defends the guilty, jurors who acquit criminals, prosecutors who are more concerned to promote their own reputations than they are to establish justice, and others who refuse to accept the responsibilities of human freedom. How many of us are entirely free from guilt?

Shigalov represents the principle of evil masquerading as good and it is this with which Dostoevsky identifies the antichrist. Says Berdyaev:

The principle of antichrist is not the old wickedness that springs to the eye in all its grossness: it is a new principle, refined, attractive, looking like goodness, and the superficial likeness between the evil anti-Christian principle and the good Christian principle is a source of great danger. The image of good begins to be "divided," Christ's image fades away and is merged into that of antichrist. Men appear with divided minds . . . Dostoevsky foresaw this state of mind, and his description of it was prophetic. When he has reached an extremity of inner division and is psychologically unbalanced, with all the customary landmarks wiped out and no new ones in sight, then man hears the call of antichrist.¹²

Like Shigalov, the Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov* is a humanitarian, is full of pity for mankind. There is reflected here a state of moral confusion in which the two principles of good and evil are not clearly distinguished. The Grand Inquisitor provides for man's happiness at the expense of his freedom. This may not be unrelated to his disbelief in God. In the place of God, the Grand Inquisitor, Shigalov, and all the exponents of the self-willed idea put up a deified man, a tyrant, or a minority ruling group in whose hands authority is to rest. According to Berdyaev, this idea of the self-deified man was

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 201.

first enunciated by Dostoevsky. This deification of man ends when man becomes god. The man-god becomes a despot and other men become his slaves. The end is a typical totalitarian system.

IV. MAN AND THE CHRIST IMAGE

From this comparison of the meek and the self-willed characters, we see that Dostoevsky was as keenly aware of the evil within man as he was of the existence in man of the image of God. Dostoevsky found both evil and good in the heart of man. His view of human nature is the classical Christian view. Dostoevsky is thus a realist in his view of man, but there is no unrelieved pessimism in his thinking. Indeed, as Helen Iswolsky in her *Soul of Russia* has recently phrased it, "he is possibly the least pessimistic of Russian writers, for he had a deep consciousness that man was saved."¹⁸ One of the most vivid passages in all of his writings is the gospel-like scene from *Crime and Punishment* in which Sonia Marmeladova and Raskolnikov read together the story of the raising of Lazarus. "The candle-end was flickering out in the battered candle-stick, dimly lighting up in the poverty-stricken room the murderer and the harlot who had so strangely been reading together the 'eternal book.'" Raskolnikov, like Lazarus, rises again.

Dostoevsky believed not only in the possibility of man's redemption as an individual; he also believed in man's capacity for social salvation. His social ideal is most fully dealt with in the section of *The Brothers Karamazov* devoted to the Russian monk. I should like to quote a few sentences from the passage in which the monk converses with a "mysterious visitor." The visitor speaks of a time when the Kingdom of God will not be a dream, but a reality. Men will then feel a social solidarity, but first we have to go through the period of isolation.

"What do you mean by isolation?" [the monk asks.]

"Why, the isolation that prevails everywhere, above all in our age—it has not yet fully developed, it has not reached its limit yet. For every one strives to keep his individuality as apart as possible, wishes to secure the greatest possible fulness of life for himself; but meantime all his efforts result not in attaining fulness of life but self-destruction, for instead of self-realization he ends by arriving at complete solitude. . . . Everywhere in these days men have, in their mockery, ceased to understand that the true security is to be found in social solidarity rather than in isolated individual effort. But this terrible individualism must inevitably have an end, and all will suddenly understand how unnaturally they are separated from one another. . . ."

¹⁸ Sheed and Ward, 1943, p. 140.

Dostoevsky had a vision of future world harmony, touched upon in these lines and elsewhere in his novels. Reactions to his vision vary. Simmons describes it as a "sentimental lyrical effusion" and comments that "if Zossima's ethical ideal is difficult to accept, his social ideal is a direct contradiction of the pragmatic world in which we live."¹⁴ One may accept the latter statement without dismissing the vision as a mere "sentimental" effusion.

We shall have to grant that Dostoevsky provides us with no blueprints for the reconstruction of social life. He is not a social engineer. Yet he is a prophet, and I venture to suggest that the social engineer will not be able to go to work until the impulse to social change has been provided by the prophet.

Berdyaev provides the key to the proper understanding of this material when he speaks of Dostoevsky's "prophetic vision" and, elsewhere, of the "apocalypsis" of the Russian mind, of which "apocalyptic-religious movement" he calls Dostoevsky the "initial source."

It remains to ask when and how man's social redemption will be brought about, according to Dostoevsky. "When will that come to pass? and will it ever come to pass? Is it not simply a dream of ours?" he makes Zossima ask the mysterious visitor.

The question resembles that of the Pharisees reported in the Gospel of Luke as demanding to know when the Kingdom of God should come. One may guess that Dostoevsky had that passage in mind when he wrote. The mysterious visitor in Dostoevsky's novel is just as reluctant as Jesus in the gospel to say when the Kingdom of God will come. Neither one, however, has any doubt that it will come. Nor does Dostoevsky differ fundamentally from the gospel in describing *how* the kingdom is to come. In the gospel we are told that the Son of Man "first must suffer many things" (Luke 17:25). For Dostoevsky, too, the way that leads to man's redemption is the way of suffering, of sacrificial love.

There is only one means of salvation, [says Zossima] take yourself and make yourself responsible for all men's sins, that is the truth you know, friends, for as soon as you sincerely make yourself responsible for everything and for all men, you will see at once that it is really so, and that you are to blame for everyone and for all things. . . .

In other words, we, too, must become bearers of the Christ-image.

¹⁴ E. J. Simmons, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

Values in the Vulgate

ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT

An intriguing study of textual differences between the Vulgate and the Authorized Version, covering the historical books of the Old Testament

OBEDIENT to Adam's curse, I earn my bread by the sweat of my browsing. Lately this has been in a big, black volume of the Vulgate, the publisher's imprint being "*Paris, Librairie Letouzey et Ane, 87 Boulevard Raspail, 87.*" The title page indicates that it is the eighth edition prepared by Aloisius Claudius Fillion and the *Imprimatur* is dated September 8, 1887. Someone has said that the Vulgate is the best commentary on the Scripture yet produced. It certainly is as rich in suggestions as Dr. Luccock finds the new translations, though it dates from Jerome in his cave at Bethlehem, toward the close of the fourth century. So in a day when new versions blossom like the rows, I turn your attention to a very old one. Gnaw with me on its roots. Your forgotten Latin will revive as you read. I myself risk coming in like a lion and going out like mutton, for my zest as an amateur much exceeds my skill as a scholar.

Confining our study, for reasons of space, to the historical books of the Old Testament, I introduce my categories.

I. VULGATE PASSAGES THAT DIFFER FROM THE AUTHORIZED VERSION

Some of these differences are mild though marked, some are radical, some are additions or omissions. A mild difference is found in Gen. 32:28, where the angel gives the reason for changing Jacob's name: "For as a prince thou hast power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." "*Quoniam si contra Deum fortis fuisti, quanto magis contra homines praevaleris.*" (For if you have been strong against God, how much more shall you prevail against men.)

Gen. 36:24. "This was that Anak that found the mules in the wilderness." "*Iste est Ana qui invenit aquas calidas in solitudine.*" His discovery was not mules but hot springs.

In Exod. 28:17-21 several differences are conspicuous in the order

of the precious stones in Aaron's breastplate as given in the Vulgate and the A. V.

You will find on comparison with the A. V. that Lev. 22:23-24 is far more specific in the Latin. "*Bovem et ovem, aure et cauda amputatis, voluntarie offerre potes, votum autem ex eis solvi non potest. Omne animal, quod vel contritis, vel tuis, vel sectis ablatisque testiculis est, non offeretis Domino.*" (Bullock and lamb with ear and tail cut off, you may offer for a freewill offering, but a vow cannot be fulfilled with these. Any animal bruised or crushed, or with testicles cut off and carried away, you shall not offer to the Lord.)

In Num. 8:2 the Vulgate has a variation and addition. "Speak unto Aaron, and say unto him" (so far both versions are the same; the A. V. goes on). "When thou lightest the lamps the seven lamps shall give light over against the candlestick." The very different Vulgate in this place has: "*Cum posueris septem lucernas, candelabrum in australi parte erigatur. Hoc igitur praecepe ut lucernae contra boream e regione respiciant ad mensam panum propositionis; contra eam partem, quam candelabrum respicit, lucere debebunt.*" (When you have placed the seven lamps, set up the candlestick in the south part. This therefore teach, that the lamps against the north look toward the table of the showbread; over against that part, which the candlestick looks upon, they ought to shine.)

In the story of Miriam's leprosy Num. 12:12 reads: "Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb." But this differs greatly from "*Ne fiat haec quasi mortua, et ut abortivum quod projicitur de vulva matris suae; ecce jam medium carnis ejus devoratum est a lepra.*" (Do not make her as the dead and as an abortion which is projected from the vulva of her mother. Behold already half her flesh is devoured by leprosy!)

In verse 14, where the A. V. words are "Should she not be ashamed seven days?" the Latin is "*Nonne debuerat saltem septem diebus rubore suffundi?*" (Ought she not at least seven days to be suffused with redness?) Effect for cause.

In reference to the word *vulva* it should be noted that uniformly where the Authorized Version speaks of closing the womb in the case of a woman who does not bear children, the Vulgate closes not the uterus but the vulva. "*Concluserat enim Dominus omnem vulvam domus Abimelech*" (Gen. 20:18). Also of Hannah (*I Reg. i.e. I Sam. 1:8*)

"*Dominus autem concluserat vulvam ejus.*" So in other places. The Vulgate uses the now geographical and the A. V. the now geological word.

In reference to *uterus*, there must have been ancient surgery (as we know from the Caesarian operation) or at least dissection enough to know the shape of the organ, for *uterus* is akin to the word used for waterskin or bottle. Abraham (Gen. 21:14) gave Hagar a bottle of water. This was *utrem aquae*. Later she filled (verse 19) the bottle, *implevit utrem*. It is notable that the word *uterus* in the Vulgate is not exclusively feminine. Sometimes when descendants are spoken of as coming from the loins of a man *uterus* is the word used.

In Num. 16:42-43 the A. V. has: "And it came to pass, when the congregation was gathered against Moses and against Aaron, that they looked toward the tabernacle of the congregation: and behold, the cloud covered it, and the glory of the Lord appeared. And Moses and Aaron came before the tabernacle of the congregation." This differs in meaning from the Vulgate. Verse 42: "*Cumque oriretur seditio, et tumultus incresceret* (And when the rebellion arose and the tumult increased), verse 43: *Moyses et Aaron fugerunt ad tabernaculum foederis. Quod, postquam ingressi sunt, operuit nubes, et apparuit gloria Domini.* (Moses and Aaron fled to the tabernacle of the congregation. Which, after they had gone within, clouds covered, and the glory of the Lord appeared.)

These interesting variations appear at the end of Deuteronomy. One, chiefly verbal, is in the familiar "As thy days, so shall thy strength be" (33:25). "*Sicut dies juventutis tuae, ita et senectus tua.*" (As the days of thy youth, so also thy old age.) But the other difference is more than verbal (34:7). It is said of Moses that "his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." The Vulgate passage is: "*Non caligavit oculus ejus, nec dentes illius moti sunt.*" (Nor was his eye darkened, nor were his teeth removed.)

In Judg. 8:4, "*et prae lassitudine, fugientes persequi non poterant*" differs notably from "faint, yet pursuing." In I Sam. 4:4, "Israel was smitten before the Philistines," but the Latin says, "*terga vertit Israel Philisthaeis*" (Israel turned backs to the Philistines)—so they must have been smitten in reverse.

So also were the Ashdodites, for (*I Reg.* i.e. I Sam. 5:6) God *percussit in secretiori parte natium* (genitive plural of *natis*, rump) *Azotum et*

fines ejus. This is more specific than the same verse in the A. V. The English verse 6 ends here, and the text nowhere has this continuation from the Vulgate, which is necessary to explain why five golden mice were later made as an offering: "*Et ebullierunt villae et agri in medio regionis illius, et nati sunt mures, et facta est confusio mortis magnae in civitate.*" (And villas and fields in the midst of that region bubbled forth, and mice were born, and the confusion of a great death was created in the state.)

In the same chapter, verses 8 and 9 in the Vulgate are widely different from the A. V. with many additions, beginning with the question "*Quid faciemus de arca Dei Israel?*" The English answer is, "Let the ark of the God of Israel be carried about unto Gath." But in the Vulgate, "*Responderunt Gethae?*" (the Gathites answered) "*Circumducatur arca Dei Israel. Et circumduxerunt arcam Dei Israel.*" (Let the ark of the God of Israel be led about. And they led about the ark, etc.) Then verse 9 is a mosaic of variations. *Illis autem circumducentibus eam, fiebat manus Domini per singulas civitates interfectionis magnae nimis; et percutiebat viros uniuscujusque urbis, a parvo usque ad majorem, et computrescebant prominentes extales eorum. Inieruntque Gethaei consilium, et fecerunt sibi sedes pelliceas.*

This, not to translate too literally, is a terrible picture of the hand of God making an "exceeding great killing" among those leading about the ark through every single city, smiting the men of every town from the small to the great, while their "protruding rectums putrefied. And the Gathites went into council and made for themselves seats of skins."

I Sam. 14:41 is in English a verse of two sentences, "Therefore Saul said unto the Lord God of Israel, Give a perfect lot. And Saul and Jonathan were taken: but the people escaped." Now in the Vulgate, between those two sentences, is this passage wholly omitted in the A. V.: "*Quid est quod non responderis servo tuo hodie? Si in me, aut in Jonatha filio meo, est iniquitas haec, da ostensionem; aut si haec iniquitas est in populo tuo, da sanctitatem.*" (Why is it thou dost not answer thy servant today? If in me, or in Jonathan my son, is this iniquity, give us a showdown; or if this iniquity is in thy people, give us sanctuary.)

In 15:4 is another interesting difference. "And Saul gathered the people together, and numbered them in Telaim" is found to be *Praecepit itaque Saul populo, et recensuit eos quasi agnos* (and counted them like lambs). And in the next verse when Saul "laid wait in the valley," it

was *in torrente*—in the dry course of a spring torrent. In verse 12 when Saul “set him up a place,” the Vulgate is needed to explain what kind of place: “*erexisset sibi fornicem triumphalem*” (he erected for himself a triumphal arch).

In I Sam. 17:35 David is telling King Saul how he killed “a lion and a bear.” “I caught him by his beard, and smote him, and slew him.” The “and smote him” in the Vulgate is the more likely *suffocabam* (I suffocated or choked him to death). That this verb and the verb for “slew him” are in the imperfect (*interficiebamque*) is good. He probably was a long time doing it.

When David was bringing home the ark with great rejoicing in II Sam. 6, the Vulgate records a beautiful event entirely omitted from the A. V. It occurs as a last sentence in verse 12: “*Et erant cum David septem chori et victima vituli*” (there were with David seven choral dances and calves for the sacrifice)—really a great addition to the jubilant procession, seven groups of dancers, each singing around a (probably) garlanded and beautiful calf! In verse 19 the supplied word *wine* is *oleo* (oil) in the Vulgate.

Another revealing passage in the Vulgate does not appear in the A. V. In II Sam. 13:21 David gets the news of Amnon’s abuse of Tamar. “He was very wroth,” though the Vulgate says *sad—contristatus est valde*—then this, wholly new to readers of the A. V.: *et noluit contristare spiritum Amnon, filii sui, quoniam diligebat eum, quia primogenitus erat ei.*” (He was not willing to grieve the spirit of Amnon, his son, because he loved him, for he was his firstborn.) Does this explain why a too easy father had lawless sons like Amnon and rebellious ones like Absalom and Adonijah?

The form of David’s anxious inquiry, “Is the young man Absalom safe?” (II Sam. 18:29 and 32) is *Estne pax puero Absalom?* in the Latin version. (Is peace with the boy Absalom?)

In I Kings 2:28 it is said that “Joab had turned after Adonijah though he had not turned after Absalom.” It astonished me to read in my copy of the Vulgate for “after Absalom” *post Salomonem*, quite surely error.

After hurricane, earthquake, and fire, Elijah heard “a still small voice” (I Kings 19:12). In the Vulgate these words are “*sibilus aurae tenuis*” (a hissing of thin air, meaning a whisper). In II Kings 2:14 Elisha “took the mantle of Elijah that fell from him, and smote the

waters, and said, Where is the Lord God of Elijah? and when he also had smitten the waters, they parted hither and thither; and Elisha went over." But why did Elisha make that desperate cry? The Vulgate, with a story not in the A. V., gives the reason in a few added words within the same verse: "*Et pallio Eliae* (and with the mantle of Elijah) *quod ceciderat ei* (which fell to him, not from him, changing the antecedent) *percussit aquas*" (he smote the waters). Now comes Elisha's surprise: *et non sunt divisae* (the waters were not divided) *et dixit: Ubi est Deus Eliae etiam nunc?* (expressive *nunc*). Now again the story coincides with the A. V., which has not told us that Elisha had to try twice. *Percussitque aquas et divisae sunt huc atque illuc, et transiit Eliseus*, a relieved man after a scare. When the sons of the prophets urged Elisha to send out a search party for Elijah, the A. V. says they did so till he was "ashamed." The Vulgate word is one of mere consent, *acquiesceret*.

Elisha promises the childless Shunamite that she should "embrace a son" (II Kings 4:16), at a time which the Vulgate makes too previous by this version: "*Habebis in utero filium.*"

Maybe the variations in verses 23-24 of the same chapter are worth noting. The Shunamite's husband asks her why she is going to the man of God. "And she said, It shall be well." (Vulgate *Vadam*, simply "I will go.") In the next verse her words to her servant (*puero*) vary in these particulars. A. V.: "Slack not thy riding for me, except I bid thee." Vulgate: *Ne mihi moram facias in eundo* (make no delay for me in going) *et hoc age quod praecipio tibi* (and do that which I instruct you).

"Manasseh filled Jerusalem from one end to the other" with blood (A. V. II Kings 21:16); but in the Vulgate is a different figure: "*usque ad os*" (to the mouth or throat).

We find Nehemiah, not in "Shushan the palace" (Neh. 1:1) but in "*Susis castro*," the camp. In the apocryphal book Tobit the differences from the A. V. amount to paraphrase.

Esther "*erat enim formosa valde*" (literally, "mighty shapely!") "*et incredibili pulchritudine*" (and of incredible beauty). This description of her beauty is not in the A. V. Other variations are "*tradensque me morti et periculo* (delivering me to death and danger, 4:16) for "if I perish, I perish." Instead of touching the scepter as in the A. V., Esther "*osculata est summitatem virgae eius*" (kissed the tip of his rod,

5:2). The A. V. (in 5:6) does not include the description of the king's drunken condition before he asks Esther her petition: "*Postquam vinum biberat abundanter.*" The whole story in the Vulgate is more vivid. The gallows prepared for Haman in the first reference is called *trabem*, but chapter 5 ends: "*et iussit excelsam parari crucem*" (he ordered the lofty cross to be prepared).

II. PASSAGES FAR RICHER IN SUGGESTED MEANINGS IN THE VULGATE

In Gen. 5:24 the Vulgate does not say that "Enoch was not," but *Ambulavitque cum Deo, et non apparuit, quia tulit eum Deus.*" (So also Moffatt.) When Abraham "sojourned in Gerar" (Gen. 20:1) the language is "*Peregrinatus est in Geraris.*" Does not the peregrination in that verb give you a picture of the roving of a grazing people even when temporarily located in one place? When Gen. 23:3 tells us that Abraham "stood up from before his dead," we are not given half the picture of the Vulgate translation, "*Surrexisset ab officio funeris,*" and the English reference to the "cave" in the ninth verse does not reveal the double burial place of *speluncam duplicem*.

Rebecca (Gen. 24:18, A. V.) "let down her pitcher upon her hand," but a far more natural picture of how this would be done is "*Deposuit hydriam super ulnam suam*" (on her elbow). Phineas in his zeal (Num. 25:8) "thrust both of them through, the man of Israel and the woman through her belly," but the Vulgate is geographically more minute: "*in locis genitalibus.*"

What color is given to the sadness and shame of a divorced woman by calling her *repudiata* (Num. 30:10)! Last week at a banquet a waitress grazed my ear by a bracelet worn on her left wrist, but the Vulgate word for bracelets is *dextralia* (Num. 31:50) suggesting that they were always worn on the right arm. "*Non usurpabis nomen Domini Dei tui frustra*" (Deut. 5:11) is more expressive in its verb than the English version.

In the ancient colors, blue is *hyacinthina* (Exod. 28:31 and 37). The Vulgate translation "said it with flowers." Scarlet (Exod. 28:33) is *cocco bis tincto* (ablative of means), a color indicated by the process of producing it. The *coccum* was the berry of the scarlet oak used for dye. One squeeze of it would be pink, but twice tintured (*bis tincto*) by the dye, the curtain becomes scarlet.

In Exod. 36:6 Moses "caused it to be proclaimed throughout the

camp," but listen: "*Jussit ergo Moyses praeconis voce cantari*" (literally, to be sung by the voice of the herald). How much more vivid! You hear the high sing-song by which the voice reached a multitude before the day of the amplifier. Exod. 38:25 speaks "of them that were numbered of the congregation." How did they count them? The Latin version of that tame expression is "*qui transierunt ad numerum*," which gives you a picture of Israel marching single file past men who count them as they "go across to the number." And isn't *sua de speculis mulierum* (verse 8 *idem*) rich for "looking glasses of the women"?

In Judg. 2:12 "they forsook the Lord God." There is a spiritual insight in the Latin, *Ac dimiserunt Dominum Deum* (they sent the Lord God away). In Judg. 3:15 Ehud is represented as "a man left-handed," for which the Vulgate expression is "*qui utraque manu pro dextera utebatur*" (who used either hand for the right). And when he passed beyond the quarries (verse 26) it is *pertransiit locum idolorum*, which suggests the place of origin and the stony futility of the heathen gods.

When a man said "Sibboleth" at the fords of the Jordan (Judg. 12:6) "they took him and slew him," but the A. V. does not, like the Vulgate, show that the poor victim was stabbed in the jugular vein. *Statimque apprehensum jugulabant in ipso Jordanis transitu*.

In Judg. 20:5 our A. V. has an utterly pathetic expression: "And my concubine have they forced that she is dead." But surely it has not the raging, vivid hell of "*et uxorem meam incredibili furore libidinis vexantes*" (and torturing my wife by the incredible fury of their lust).

When Ruth (1:18) is "steadfastly minded" to go with Naomi it is *obstinato animo* (is she not *mulier*? but this is a whimsicality); and when Boaz (Ruth 2:16) orders the reapers to "let fall also some of the handfuls of purpose for her, and leave them, that she may glean them," at this point the A. V. omits "*absque robore*," without redness, that is, blushing. "He winnoweth barley to-night in the threshing-floor" (3:2), "*hac nocte aream hordei ventilat*"—is not that *ventilat* expressive? And do you not see, when David picks his stones for his sling, the wash of ages of water over the "five smooth stones out of the brook" (1 Sam. 17:40) in the beautiful *quinque limpidissimos lapides de torrente*?

What did Saul mean when he promised the man who should kill Goliath to "make his father's house free in Israel" (1 Sam. 17:25)? The Vulgate says *faiet absque tributo* (shall make free from tax).

Samuel is about to hew Agag in pieces before the Lord (I Sam. 15:32-33). I used to wonder how "Agag came unto him delicately." Moffatt is less mincing: "with tottering steps." But the real tragicomic vividness is in the Vulgate. There isn't any coming on Agag's part, he is brought. "*Et oblatuſ est ei Agag pinguiſſimuſ et tremenſ*, literally "superlatively fat and trembling." It is a Falstaffian picture of corpulence which terror reduces to a jellylike *corpuſquake*. St. Jerome had an eye for details. And he details more than mere posture when Saul goes into the cave "to cover his feet" (I Sam. 24:3). "*Eratque ibi ſpelunca, quam ingreſſuſ eſt Saul ut purgaret ventrem.*" As Mr. Chips ſays, "I need not tranſlate."

When David attempted to bring home the ark (II Sam. 6:6) Uzzah put his hand to it, "for the oxen ſhook it." In the Vulgate theſe five words become terribly alive: *quoniam calcitrabant boveſ et declinaverunt eam*, "because the cattle kicked and tilted (the ark) over at an angle." In the account in I Chronicles (I Par. XIII:9) it is *boſ* (ſingular) *quippe laſciviens paululum* (ſporting a little) *inclinaverat eam* (inclined it). A leſſ vigorous account than the former. There may, however, be ſporting ſpecifications in *laſciviens*.

When Joab and the ſervants of David met "by the pool of Gibeon" (II Sam. 2:13), the Vulgate *piscinam* tells you it waſ a fiſhpound. Bathsheba's *ne confundaſ faciem meam* (III Reg. II:20 or I Kings 2:20, the Samuel bookſ being Kings in the Vulgate) iſ much ſtronger than "ſay me not nay." And one iſ delighted to find that when Solomon (I Kings 3:9) aſkſ for "an underſtanding heart" it iſ *cor docile*, a heart that can be taught.

In Solomon's famous judgment between the two motherſ who claim the living babe, the Vulgate iſ much more realistic. Read I Kings 3:22: "And the other woman ſaid, Nay; but the living iſ my ſon, and the dead iſ thy ſon. And thiſ ſaid, No; but the dead iſ thy ſon, and the living iſ my ſon." Gentle ladies! Now liſten to the Latin: "*Reſponditque altera mulier: Non eſt ita ut dicis* (it iſ not aſ you ſay) *ſed filiſ tuuſ mortuuſ eſt, meuſ autem vivit. E contrario illa dicebat: Mentiriſ* (you lie!); *filiuſ quippe meuſ vivit* (my ſon certainly liveſ) *et tuuſ mortuuſ eſt.*"

The Vulgate iſ more vivid about Solomon's women. "Solomon clave unto theſe in love" (I Kings 11:2) iſ a pale ſynopſiſ of the tranſlation, *Hiſ itaque copulatuſ eſt Salomon ardentiffimo amore*. (Again,

see Mr. Chips.) "His wives turned away his heart after other gods" (verse 4) is tepid compared with the same lines in the Latin: *Depravatum est cor eius per mulieres ut sequeretur deos alienos*. (The heart of him was depraved through women that he should follow alien gods.)

The sarcastic Jezebel is more like her own self in Latin. "Dost thou now govern the kingdom of Israel?" (I Kings 21:7) This is pale beside the terrible sarcasm of the Vulgate: *Grandis auctoritatis es, et bene regis regnum Israel!* And the arrow which entered Ahab "between the joints of the harness" (I Kings 22:34) is more specifically located in the older version *inter pulmonem et stomachum*.

How much more effective than "Alas, master!" (II Kings 6:5) is the threefold wail, "*Heu! heu! heu! domine mi.*" And in the next chapter "*cataractas in caelo*" is more vivid than "windows in heaven" and a different image. When Jehu *percussit Joram inter scapulas* the Vulgate is more specific than the English. And how suggestive the meaning of these:

"*Ascensores*" (from the verb *to ascend*) for riders of horses.

"*Flevit itaque Ezechias fletu magno*" ("wept with a great weeping" (IV Reg. XX:2).

"*Insanisti in me.*" (A. V. "rage") (IV Reg. XIX:28).

"*Robustissimi ad pugnandum.*" (I Par. VII:5).

"*Heri quoque, et nudiustertius*" (I Par. XI:2—yesterday also and the third day before now) is better than "moreover in time past" (A. V.).

Instead of "To be feared above all gods" (I Chron. 16:25) the Vulgate has the startling "*Horribilis super omnes deos.*"

Nehemiah has more reason to be "sore afraid" (*timui valde ac nimis*) if the King's statement was as the Vulgate gives it, without the mildness of the English version: "*sed malum nescio quod in corde tuo est*" (but I know not the evil which is in thy heart).

We learn that the pool of Siloam was once a fish pond (Neh. 3:15) when it is characterized as "*piscinae Siloe.*"

In Neh. 8:3 "the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law," but it is a more effective metaphor of the quadruped to be told that those ears were "*eractae ad librum.*" And *Tacete* (8:11) is a briefer way of saying "shut up!" than "hold your peace."

Vivid expressions are: "*Flebat igitur mater eius irremediabilibus lacrymis*" (Tobit 10:4; *Liber Tobiae* X:4). And this picture of the little dog is amusing and modern: "*Tunc praecurrit canis, qui simul*

fuera in via, et quasi nuntius adveniens, blandimento suae caudae gaudebat" (XI:9). Then his dog ran before him, who was also in the road, and like an oncoming bearer of tidings rejoiced with the blandishment—wagging—of his tail.

In *II Par.* XXIII:9 the word *peltas* (accusative) for "shields" shows that they were made of hides. In the same chapter is recorded the swearing of allegiance to Joash ("*imprecatique sunt ei*"), omitted from A. V., and the cry is not "God save the king!" but "*Vivat rex!*" How descriptive, too, is Athaliah's cry of treason, "*Insidiae! Insidiae!*"

The description of Ezra as a ready scribe is speeded up in the expression "*velox in lege.*" "The man of understanding" (Ezra 8:18) is "*virum doctissimum,*" or superlatively taught.

III. SIGNIFICANT USE OF NAMES IN THE VULGATE

Often where we have a name in the A. V., in the Latin we have its translation or meaning. Then again, the Vulgate by a proper name will give a flash of light. In Exod. 17:7, "He called the name of the place Massah and Meribah." In the Vulgate the name is *Tentatio*, or temptation, which is the meaning of Massah. Meribah is ignored.

Exod. 28:30, "Thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim." What these were has never been known. Adam Clarke has a very interesting discussion in his commentary. The word Urim signifies Lights; Thummim, Perfections. (So also the Abingdon Commentary.) The Septuagint translates, "the manifestation and the truth;" Moffatt, "the sacred lots." In the Vulgate the words are "*Pones autem in rationali iudicii Doctrinam et Veritatem* (accusative, doctrine and truth) *quae erunt in pectore Aaron.*" We find them again, in the nominative, in Lev. 8:8, *Doctrina et veritas.*

An informing change of names occurs in Num. 24:24, where Chittim is found in the Vulgate to be *Italia*. And in Num. 33:16 the Vulgate gives a meaning—*sepulchra concupiscentiae* (the graves of those who lusted)—where the A. V. gives only a name, Kibroth-hattaavah.

When Samuel sets up a stone and calls it Ebenezer (I Sam. 7:12) the Vulgate says *vocavit nomen loci illius, Lapis adjutorii*—the Stone of helps. God's "anointed" is *christus* (I Sam. 12:3 and too many others for reference) and an enemy is sometimes a *satan*. When Solomon is at peace and ready to build the temple he says (*III Reg.* 5:4 or I Kings *idem*) "*et non est satan.*"

In *III Reg.* 15:13 (A. V. I Kings, same) a very specific name throws great light on heathen worship in Judah. The obscene Priapus is too well known to classical students to need description. "*Insuper et Maacham matrem suam amovit, ne esset princeps in sacris Priapi, et in luco eius quem consecraverat; subvertitque specum ejus et confregit simulacrum turpissimum, et combussit in torrente Cedron.*" Translated: "Moreover he (Asa) removed ("from being queen" A. V.) Maachah his mother that she might not be chief in the rites of Priapus and in his grove which she had consecrated; and he turned upside down his grotto and smashed his most shameful image, and burned it in the brook Kidron." (Dry much of the year.) Comparison will show that the A. V. gives no suggestion of Priapus. Asa removed his mother "because she had made an idol in a grove; and Asa destroyed her idol, and burnt it by the brook Kidron." The vivid particularizations of her turpitude are only in the Vulgate.

"*Et marmor Parium abundantissime*" tells us that the "marble stones in abundance" of I Chron. 29:2 were Parian marble.

Where in II Chron. 12:3 we have "the Lubim, the Sukkiim, and the Ethiopians," *Parlipomenon* has "*Libyes silit* (Libyans) *et Troglodytae et Ethiopes*," the interest being in the word "Troglodyte."

The meaningless "Achmetha" in Ezra 6:2 interests us as *Ecbatanis* in the Vulgate. But most interesting of all is the record that Amaziah *apprehendit Petram in praelio*. The famous Edomite city of red rocks, Petra! We miss this when we read in II Kings 14:7 that he took "the rock" or Selah.

IV. QUAINTESS OF EXPRESSION IN THE VULGATE

Many of the Vulgate texts are interesting for their quaintness. The A. V. describes Adam and Eve as both naked "and they were not ashamed," where in the Vulgate the verb is "*et non erubescabant*" (Gen. 2:25), i.e. they "did not grow red" about it, or blush. In Gen. 25:22 where the A.V. says "the children struggled together within her," the Vulgate in the language of modern highway traffic has "*Sed collidebantur in utero.*" Esau's feast and departure in Gen. 25:34 is recorded with Caesarian conciseness: "*Comedit, et bibit, et abiit.*" In Gen. 33:6 and other places where people "bowed themselves" (A. V.), the Latin version picturesquely says "*incurvati sunt*" (they curved themselves inward).

As a farmer boy I fed the chickens with "cracked corn." It gave

me a thrill to read in the Vulgate (Lev. 2:16) of the identical thing: "*farris fracti*." It does not necessarily refer to maize, but I have seen maize growing in Palestine. When in Lev. 8:24 thumbs and great toes are to be touched with blood, it cheers one to read "*pollices manus ae pedis*," the "thumbs of the hand and foot." In Num. 24:8 God "hath as it were the strength of a unicorn." But just listen to the Latin: "*Cuius fortitudo similis est rhinocerotis*." This, allowing for the genitive inflection, is our identical word "rhinoceros." But it seems whimsical to imagine a pastor cheering up a patient on the ground that his God has the fortitude of a rhinoceros. The biblical English noun "suckling" (Deut. 32:25 and many other places) is *lactantem* (accusative), "milker."

If one lives too close to his English derivatives he will see quaintness in the idea of being saturated with bread, "*Comedebamus panem in saturiata*" (Exod. 16:3), but whimsicality I suppose is not scholarship. And "*morte morietur*" (Exod. 31:14) "let him die (ablative of agent) by means of a death" may not really be stranger than the familiar "die the death."

When Elijah on Carmel has demanded the great test between the Lord and Baal the people answer, "It is well spoken" (I Kings 18:24), "*Respondens omnis populus ait; Optima propositio*." How modern: "That's the best proposition!"

Quaint and sad is the idiom by which the poor boy of Shunem in the harvest field says, "My head, my head!" (II Kings 4:19) "*Caput meum doleo, caput meum doleo*," literally, "I pain my head." "*Veni, et videamus nos*" (IV Reg. XIV:8) "Let us see us" is the literal expression of "Come, and let us look one another in the face."

V. VULGATE PASSAGES THAT APPEAL TO THE POETIC IMAGINATION

Many passages in the ancient Latin deeply move the imagination, and others pleasantly appeal to the fancy, perhaps by the music of the language. For the robe of the ephod all of blue—the hyacinth flower—Moses was directed to make (Exod. 28:33-34) "pomegranates of blue, and of purple and of scarlet round about the hem thereof; and bells of gold between them round about; a golden bell and a pomegranate, a golden bell and a pomegranate," etc. But hear the Poe-like tintinnabulation of the diction: "*Ex hyacintho, et purpura, et cocco bis tincto, mixtis in medio tintinnabulis, ita ut tintinnabulum sit aureum et malum punicum, rursumque tintinnabulum aliud aureum et malum punicum*."

Sometimes the language actually rhymes, as when (*III Reg. i.e. I Kings 12:21*) Rehoboam assembles from Judah and Benjamin "*centum octoginta millia electorum virorum bellatorum.*"

Sometimes the verbs are vigorous. Moses *proiecit* and *confregit* the tables of stone against the root of the mountain (*radicem montis*) and then he tackles the golden calf (*Exod. 32:20*) "*arripiensque vitulum quem fecerant, combussit, et contrivit usque ad pulverem, quem sparsit in aquam*" and gives Israel to drink. When the Lord kills Onan (*Gen. 38:10*), "*Percussit eum Dominus.*" When enemies or sinners are smitten—*percussit*—oh, most lusty verb!

If adequately washed, no one could doubt that (*Lev. 13:40*) "*Vir, de cuius capite capilli fluunt, calvus et mundus est.*" The cruel poetry of this reference to the bald is not in the alliteration but the metaphor "from whose head the hairs flow down." Worse than

"See, thy hairs are falling all,
Poor Anacreon, how they fall!"

Israel was to keep the laws (*Lev. 20:22*) "*ne et vos evomat terra,*" an expression both poetic and emetic. Quite the reverse took place, ghastly deglutition! when Korah, Dathan and Abiram rebelled and (*Numeri XVI:30*) "*aperiens terra os suum deglutiatur eos*" and the gloomy epic adds "*descenderintque viventes in infernum, scietis quod blasphemaverint Dominum.*"

In fact, Dantesque gloom and terror loom in the Vulgate. You feel it tremendously in the storm and darkness of the Egyptian plagues. You feel it in the wail of Israel (*Num. 14:3, Vulgate XIV:3*), which reads in the A. V., "Would God we had died in the wilderness!" The words for "in the wilderness" are "*in hac vasta solitudine,*" and any who has ever traveled those wildernesses knows that "vast solitude" is the perfect word. When the "fiery serpents" are translated, the genius of Jerome is again aflame (*Num. 21:6*): "*Misit Dominus in populum ignitos serpentes*"—ignited snakes!

When Reuben, Gad and Half-Manasseh went back across Jordan after the conquest, they built as a memorial that they still belonged to Israel (*Josh. 22:10*) "an altar by Jordan, a great altar to see to." Contrast this anticlimax with the Vulgate record. Exaggeration, I know, and indefinite, like something colossal in the fog, but that altar looms in the imagination with Miltonic sublimity. "*Aedificaverunt juxta Jordanem altare infinitae magnitudinis.*" An altar of infinite magnitude!

There are pictures of nature as impressive as this gigantic altar over Jordan. You read in I Sam. 24:2, "upon the rocks of the wild goats." This same passage (*I Reg. XXIV:3*) startles your eyes with spectacular scenery: "*super abruptissimas petras quae solis ibicibus perviae sunt.*" What abrupt and terrible rocks, trodden only by the ibex!

II Sam. 2:18 tells us that Asahel "was as light of foot as a wild roe." Good. And the wild roe is probably swifter than a goat. But the Vulgate has "*Asael cursor velocissimus fuit, quasi unus de capreis quae morantur in silvis.*" Whether translation or not, the last five words picture a more leafy wilderness than the words "wild roe."

There is a pathos of suffering in the Vulgate expression for *stoning* a person. Sometimes it is the direct verb with object, as *lapidabat eum*, but often, and oh how descriptive! it is some form of the verb "to oppress" with stones. When in Lev. 24:23 the blasphemer is stoned, it is *lapidibus oppresserunt*, and when in Num. 14:10 the congregation is ready to stone Joshua and Caleb, the record is "*et lapidibus eos vellet opprimere.*"

A touch of pathos makes you sorry for Sisera when in the *carmen triumphale Debborae* (*Jud. V:27*)

"Inter pedes ejus ruit, defecit et mortuus est:

Volvebatur ante pedes ejus, et jacebat exanimis et miserabilis."

Among vigorous Vulgate verbs is a very expressive one of scorn. It was the law (Deut. 25:9) that if a man refused to do his duty by brother's widow she should, in the presence of the elders, loose his shoe "and spit in his face." Listen! "*Spuetque in faciem.*" Can any verb ever *expect to rate* like that as an utterance of scorn? "Spue" and "spit" are kindred, and this verb reminds me of a foreigner in Montpelier, Vermont, who wanted to buy a spittoon, and having an indigent vocabulary, finally asked for "one of them things that you *spuke* in."

The temptation in reading Latin is to rush to the nearest English derivative instead of locating the word which really makes the best translation; though of course to read aright we should *think* in Latin and not translate at all. No doubt I Kings 14:9, last clause, is better translated in the A. V. by thou "hast cast me behind thy back" than by the irreverent whimsicality which the nearest derivative would make of the same words in the Vulgate version: "*me autem projecisti post corpus tuum.*" Another Latin word which is too grimly translated (i.e. not at all) by its nearest derivative is *cadaver*. (*Numeri XIV:29.*)

Flent contra me (they weep against me, Num. 11:13) is the pathetic complaint of Moses to God. Sad but beautifully poetic is either version, that the Lord God shall smite Israel (I Kings 14:15) "as a reed is shaken in the water"—"*sicut moveri solet arundo in aqua*," or "scatter them beyond the river"—*ventilabit eos trans flumen*. This *ventilabit* is a figure of the threshing-floor. "Scatter"? Yes, as the wind blows the chaff afar in the winnowing of the grain.

"*Ut aedificem domum nomini Domini Dei mei. . . .*" (II Par. II:4) has rhyme and alliteration. And for sublime music hear this, the translation of which you may read in I Chron. 29:11-12 (I Par. XXIX: 11-12): "*Tua est, Domine, magnificentia, et potentia, et gloria, atque victoria, et tibi laus; cuncta enim quae in caelo sunt, et in terra, tua sunt; tuum, Domine, regnum; et tu es super omnes principes. Tuae divitiae, et tua est gloria; tu dominaris omnium; in manu tua virtus et potentia; in manu tua magnitudo et imperium omnium.*"

T
ica
com
are
adv
thr
On
in
mo
ori
We
tion
tha
com
trib

you
ma
pos
con
as
fift
gen
Th
Fre
our
Ou
dis
the
also

Where Are Our Adolescents?

WILLIAM HUBBEN

An experienced teacher studies the temper of present-day adolescents—discovers how their elders can help them and learn from them.

THE SHOCKS of our time have caused serious dislocations in American youth. We do not need to think of juvenile delinquency when we consider such moral and spiritual changes. Many children and adolescents are having a share in our time's problems that formerly was reserved to advanced phases of maturity. The former demarcation line between the three ages—childhood, adolescence, and adulthood—have become blurred. One hears of changes in adolescence that make us think of a new species in the making, a subadult group with greater seriousness as well as a more pointed sophistication. Naturally, then, we feel the need for a new orientation also because this seems more than a one-way traffic problem. We live at an age in which grandparents share the pleasures and dissipations of adolescents; where the young have more information available than any adult generation before them; and where psychologists deal constantly with adults who suffer from emotional traits ordinarily attributed to adolescents.

I

The bewildering effects of the war and postwar era deprive the young of much of the moral and spiritual security which is one of the major conditions for growth. Youth is quite aware of its own precarious position. One can often hear from the serious among them that they consider their own elders their major problem. They are no longer as impressed by our hurling "challenges" at them as they were ten or fifteen years ago. Our generation's actions, which admittedly include a generous dash of misdeeds and failures, speak louder than our words. The grotesque spectacle of a parent generation believing in the Four Freedoms and unable to satisfy the world's most elementary needs, and our all too telling international difficulties do not go by unnoticed. Our young people read newspapers and listen to radio news; the recently disclosed scandals on war profiteering will not add any reverence to their thinking about us. They know they need their elders, but they are also at work dethroning them more readily than after the last war.

They are aware, consciously or by intuition, of the cracks in our own moral structure—and we are not helping matters when we bemoan the lower standards of conduct among the young, juvenile delinquency, the rise in crime, the increase of immorality in the armed forces here and abroad. We would do better to examine our own contributions to this moral confusion closer to home. Our children know quite well that a never-failing butter, meat, and sugar supply as well as our ample gasoline of a year ago must have come from black market contacts. They also hear of distant stories going back as far as the prohibition era and witness other strange evidence of their elders' pursuit of happiness, which includes their thriving upon the much lamented loss of free enterprise and the mounting statistics of marital troubles.

Once upon a time it was rightly called a platitude that moral conduct of children and adolescents is much more the result of contagion and a process of silent transfusion from one generation to another than the result of Sunday-school and other teaching. But this truth has to be rediscovered in our time by a large segment of our generation that never received adequate preparation for parenthood and now seeks salvation for their children's problems (not for themselves!) by demanding more religious instruction. Who would not wish for more and better religious instruction! But we are learning here a lesson from the field of politics that we are slow to perceive: man's thoughts and actions are now infinitely broader in range and consequence than ever before. There is no privacy now in matters moral, if there ever was. The same age that invented the fluoroscope also knows more of the hidden recesses of man's soul and amplifies his internal disturbances, physical and spiritual, to the point of terror. Youth is listening in, and little girls no longer need big ears to spy out secrets. Youth has not only a keen eye for streamlined machinery and streamlined teaching and preaching, but also for consistency of words and deeds.

ARE THEY ARROGANT REBELS?

What are some of the outstanding traits of adolescence?

In adolescence we probably display more contradictory trends than at any other phase of life. It is the period when the unity of personality is least apparent. This concept of unity is being debated generally by more and more students of psychology and psychiatry as well as religious leaders. We know of those stark contradictions, characterized

by Paul so convincingly and reflected in his Epistles, which divide man's essence and seem at times to fill him with "legions" of spirits. Their manifestation in mental illness, when controls are no longer functioning, are of frightening vigor and their balance in normal life is largely a moral and social problem. Some of the traits of adolescence remind us of these multiple personalities. Yet, unpleasant as they may appear, their absence in adolescence would cause us to worry. A harmonious, well-balanced, "mature" adolescent is abnormal. A strong experimental note in thought, speech, and action may bother his environment but is a healthy symptom of growth. The adolescent speaking and acting like a man of thirty is, in all likelihood, merely acting out a part and rehearsing a future role of some kind—and there is in himself a clever observer watching every move. When he relapses into childhood, he knows that an ulterior motive is back of it, particularly when sentimental aunts or grandmothers are around. He enjoys the cries of indignation coming from astonished adults who worry about him. Without these it is boring to grow up as everybody expects him to do. It is too uneventful merely to sit around and mature.

Adolescents charm us with their genius for enthusiasm. But while we may recover through them our faith in humanity, they may also, without official notice, disillusion us by seemingly cynical remarks and behavior. After a week of religious instruction in a summer camp, one of the ministers on the staff asked a student whether he now had found Christ. The young man retorted, "I didn't know he was lost!" Irreverence and blasphemy? Far from it! There was every reason to believe that the young man was sincerely religious, but he had a definite aversion against the kind of evangelism to which the camp had exposed him. A girl who after a similar experience was asked whether she loved the Lord replied, "Yes, I think so. But I'm not nuts about him." This was her way of expressing impatience with sweetness and the ways of yesterday. She wanted to say that she was far from sensing the integration she had hoped to achieve, and in this she was quite honest. If we cannot bear such language—extreme as these two samples are—we had better ask ourselves whether we are working with an age group congenial to our own temper and spiritual grasp.

Adolescent arrogance ought to be taken primarily as a projection into the rights of adulthood rather than an overbearing attitude. They are first and foremost concerned with their future and their rights;

their demand for the car key, late hours, and the cigarette are nothing but the ever-renewed claims for a certificate of graduation from childhood. They are not yet themselves but they seek the status of adulthood earlier than their parents did years ago. Our whole civilization has become youth-centered (for good and for bad) and youth, naturally, asserts its rights. The radio and press solicit their opinions on almost any questions and the publicity formerly granted only to millionaires or murderers is now being extended in a pseudo-religious cult to "the glad season of life." They marry earlier than their parents and certainly their grandparents did, and recently they were also challenged to die earlier. But the same boys and girls who are in haste to fall in love almost from a sense of duty and obligation to current fashion, also jeer at love scenes in the movies. If this be a contradiction it is part of their normal structure. When they do so, an unconscious mechanism within them may be at work deprecating what they cannot have.

GROWING PAINS

Adolescents who find themselves accepted into the company of adults easily encounter socially difficult situations, real or imagined. Adult demands on etiquette, propriety, or a mature type of humor often prove too much for them. Social promotion may come so suddenly that at a given moment of confusion there is nothing better to do than to laugh, to let go in giggling spells as a momentary anesthesia against embarrassment—or, after having made a mistake, to explain in enormous footnotes to a bored and politely listening audience some *faux pas* that nobody had noticed anyway. The reasons for being embarrassed are legion. To have to ask for an adult's company to get into a moving-picture house is humiliating. It is humiliating to be criticized and bewildering to be complimented. Such trifles as having pimples, or being too tall, too small, or too plump, having to wear glasses, or—more serious—having parents who speak a faulty English, are far from being small matters for an adolescent.

In his relations with people younger than he, the adolescent is again apt to lose his security. Girls at this particular point display their considerable advantages in general maturity over boys, who may easily appear boisterous, domineering, or unappreciative of children's interests. They remind a boy too vividly of his past imperfections; the adolescent boy is exceptional who seeks the company of little children and shares whole-

heartedly their work and play. Those aunts infuriate adolescents who express at each visit their astonishment at "how the boy has grown," or their pleasure that the girl "is now a real lady." By implication they refer to the adolescent's tragedy of having been a child in the very recent past.

This adult status at which they are aiming requires proof of superiority in many ways. Adolescents like to exchange nicknames for their own name "which I never liked anyway," or pick fitting names for friends, teachers, or contemporaries—a hobby in which they evidence striking powers of characterization. They adopt fashions in mannerisms, in new signature flourishes, and language (slang) with a sovereign disdain for tradition.

It is but a small step from this eagerness to embrace the new and untried to their tendency to accept extreme political views. Radicalism holds a lure because it promises the ultimate in social justice as positively as it shows a quick and concrete way to achieve it. That truth is complex, that justice needs to employ caution, and finally, that changes affecting millions of people call for an enormous educational effort—such truths are easily overlooked at this age. Besides, they are bristling with principles, enjoy good and bad arguments alike, and abandon a "conviction" without tears.

Oscillations between the moods of Wordsworth and their own Tarzan brand of toughness are not surprising. A boy in his early adolescence who had just seen a beautiful stage play was so impressed that he shouted, "It was so beautiful that I'd like to smack somebody in the face." The same boy who is "sick of my family" may become seriously homesick when leaving for the first time. Like young St. Augustine, they eat many a meal in their dreams but on awakening they find that they are hungry.

A TRIBE APART

In many ways they are a tribe apart from the rest of us, a clan with different customs, superstitions, rituals—and with their own secret lore, practicing a magic whose powers are, of course, known only to the initiated. That is, naturally, true of children also. Little girls breathe the breath of life into a doll with as much authority as was the Lord's when he created man. A boy playing Indian and White Man and riding at the head of a ferocious tribe of Cherokees, or playing with his railroad, actually undergoes a pseudo-mystical transmutation into a red chieftain or an engineer. A simple string between two chairs converts a living room's

corner into a prison from which no one will attempt to escape. And a shot from a wooden rifle or the touch with a cardboard dagger will kill any opponent—at least for a sufficient length of time.

Adolescents have their own technique of practicing sorcery. They may use every argument to support their disbelief in miracles. But many of them have already entered that phase of life when we all, believers or skeptics, hope fervently for an occasional private miracle of some kind. An adolescent's benign references to his parents as "the old man," or "my old lady," are not meant to transform them to silver-haired or decrepit seniors who rightfully belong in a home for the feeble. The repetition of such pseudo-pleasantries are magic incantations that cast hypnotic spells over their own minds. It advances their age by, say, ten or more years and creates the pleasant illusion that they are quite ready to shoulder responsibilities of a Herculean nature. Every age has its peculiar tricks of self-deception by which to defy its limitations. But after all, isn't it less tragic to watch adolescents hurry away from the never-recurring delights of being young than to see old men or women revert into some phase of adolescence?

II

The adolescent's growth of reasoning faculties, his capacity for self-analysis and observation, and his sex problem lead him into moral conflicts of which his childhood knew little or nothing. In spite of the many well-designed efforts to educate our adults, this last area is to many of them still *terra incognita*. Medical information and those much advertised "man-to-man" talks are, at best, aiming at removing from their minds a nasty mystery. But such teaching must be done well lest they resent it, particularly when it tries to reveal something they have known for several years. There is also reason to believe that the approach of religious leaders has not always been a happy one, especially when it analyzed sex as a huge impersonal demon of evil design. Adolescents are much more receptive to an occasional comment on a real situation that takes adequate sex information for granted. Such a semicasual approach may very well rate the problem as an important one, but it will also give it a place as only one in a large moral and spiritual order.

If it is true that youth's primary goal is to attain adult status, there will be little use in telling them that they cannot yet understand certain matters. We ought to share with them the problems *as we see*

them and let them discover for themselves whether they are ready or not to understand. We must not expect admiration or gratitude when we tell them that we truly understand them and that thirty or forty years ago we went through much the same troubles without the kind of understanding parents that young people have nowadays. All of them need our understanding but not all will express this need. Quite a few may even resist it as an intrusion upon their privacy, although these may need it most. What happened to us thirty or forty years ago is of little concern to them. The temper of adolescence changes. Around 1905 we were frightened by plays like Ibsen's *Ghosts* with its dark message on biological and moral heredity. Everybody had just gone through the Kallikak scare, illustrating the savage toll of hereditary degeneration in society. Now, after more than one generation, we enjoy *Arsenic and Old Lace* with real delight. We have not become cynical, but have sounder information on the same topic and see the problem in sane balance.

THEIR MORAL THINKING

Understanding of youth often ceases when it assures the young of their being understood. All essential communication is indirect and, as such, more relieving than a lesson or a sermon can ever be. During adolescence a great truth, an attitude, or a moral trait grows in an almost unconscious manner; in spite of the temporary illusion that "all is so near and close" at the time, only in exceptional cases can we remember moments of revelation or "openings." There is something of an elusive and beautiful echo about them. Only the self-centered teacher complains of the students' casualness and ingratitude. His unique reward is that his work is becoming an organic part of their life without bearing his copyright.

Since moral concepts are transmitted more effectively by a process of contagion than by precept, it is no surprise to see the quantitative approach of the older generation reflected in youth. To take one example: a large segment of young people see no moral difference in the theft of five dollars from the pockets of a poor man or from a millionaire. Their stereotyped answer is, "Five dollars is five dollars," and only few of them remember the parable of the widow's mite.

This is no indication, however, of religious indifference or "atheism." Much of our teaching has for them an anachronistic flavor and is not time-related. It holds little appeal to the heroic in man as long as it ac-

centuates the inhibitive and restrictive features of Christian living. There was—to take only one example—a time when it was prophetic to preach the victory of light over darkness, when the Christian believers suffered in darkness. But it will not kindle the hearts of the young as easily now when we preach it in a comfortable suburban setting.

Merely to lead a "better life" is no longer a sufficiently central challenge to young people. The world is full of good people who did, or could do, little to prevent disasters and create a Christian society. They see too many complacent Christians occupying well-cushioned pews to sense a real allegiance and many of them would sympathize with Kierkegaard's verdict of Christianity's being "an optical illusion." The philosophies of fascism and communism have held such an appeal for youth partly because they demanded sacrifice, discipline, and ultimately death, and any teaching concerning personal freedom was absent. We are not proposing to emulate this. But we need a new impetus when we interpret the meaning of Christian living. There ought to be little doubt as to the implications in a starving world. Service projects ranging all the way from work camps to foreign relief are a beginning in the right direction. Here again, the dedication and sacrifice of the adult generation would be the best kindling wood for the fire of enthusiasm we hope for.

IMMORTALITY

The surface picture of a pleasure-seeking youth is deceptive. When one sits down with them and listens to their real problems, one can hear of such truly apocalyptic fears as, "Is the world really going to blow up some day?" What only a short time ago was hollow talk has suddenly become a potentiality. Death, on the surface so remote to youth, has already moved closer to them as an actual war experience; and we notice, more than ever before, a tragic mood in youth of which the perfumed pages of magazines like *Mademoiselle* and *Seventeen* say nothing.

Those freakish doubts one can hear expressed once in a while by younger adolescents, asking whether they really are the children of their parents, may be one of the first cries of man's homesickness that will, from now on, never end and can ultimately be answered only in religious terms. Like Ishmael in *Moby Dick* we have lost the paradise of childhood and become orphans, wayward and forever searching. A strange interest in immortality arises, which the young share with old

age. As children they were as immortal and inseparable from life's wholeness as flowers and animals. Death belonged rightfully to the grandparents and the delightful fusion of dream and reality remained undisturbed. But once this harmony is split it starts youth on their quest for immortality. Literature of all ages, including the Bible, has expressed in unforgettable imagery the profound symbolism of this association of youth and death.

In *Moby Dick* we see Ishmael saved from death after the fanatical pursuit of the white whale. Back of this rescue stand those nightmarish images of the animal's anatomy and history—a weird array of flesh and bones, and finally, the stolid figure of a Puritan and a noble savage. Ishmael is the only survivor and he, who never once mentioned his parents, speaks of himself as “another orphan” when he is thrust back upon life's oceanic expanses. Never had he lived so consciously, but the gift of life is accompanied by the symbol of death: he can only remain above the water by holding on to a coffin. He is no longer immortal and he realizes that decisions between good and evil are now before him.

The Gospel scene relating Jesus' only dealings with an adolescent may, in its peculiar way, hint at this same association of death, youth, and salvation when he resurrects the widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11). The first two youths we encounter in the Old Testament, Cain and Abel, and after them Isaac, stand face to face with death. But everywhere there is an element of justice or mercy that nowadays needs foremost emphasis in religious education for living in a pagan world. Antique mythology lacks this redemptive note. Narcissus, the beautiful youth who fell in love with his own image in a fountain, lost his life as a man; the cruel finality of the gods changed him into a flower, leaving him no redemptive chances. The Christian ideal of redemptive love has not been superseded in our time by any philosophy offering help to erring or sinning man. The symbol of resurrection holds great hope for millions in our time.

III

The outstanding realms of religious difficulty for modern adolescents are contemporary relativism, the conflict between science and religion, and the problems connected with denominationalism.

The confusing mass of information and interpretation which confronts us daily leads easily to a religious relativism that was not so

rampant a generation ago. Some ask, "Does it really matter what you believe if you are only a decent fellow?" Or they point to other continents and ask, "Why do I have to believe in Christianity? The Mohammedans are O.K. too." The superficiality of much of our conventional church life may be reflected in remarks such as, "An atheist may be a better man than a churchgoer." Here real problems, which go beyond the argumentativeness mentioned above, demand a real answer. Mere counterarguments will probably not be acceptable. A new religious dedication and realism may be the better, if not the only, way to convince youth of the beauty and strength of religious faith.

This kind of thinking is matched by a fluid moral relativism which appears to hold more immediate hazards than religious vagueness. We hear excessively individualistic statements such as, "Who is to tell me what I can do or not? If a guy comes out all right, well—why bother?" Moral matters "are nobody else's business." Such remarks are not only made to get a "rise" out of a teacher, but seem to represent a real, if transitory, conviction. The recognition of superhistorical standards; the experience that there is no privacy in matters of moral decision and that they all feed into public morality; and finally that such rationalizing carries the evil odor of an ancient human vice—these truths must be brought home again to youth from the examples of our time which is so rich in illustrative material.

In its popular form the conflict between religion and science has never ceased to exert a considerable influence upon the thinking of our time and always accompanies the adolescent's awakening of his rationalistic faculties. An age that makes the taking of a vitamin pill an almost sacramental act is apt to lend a bias to all our thinking about the mission of science. Any problem appears soluble and reverence for the mysteries of life becomes part of an archaic lore. The plagiarism of radio programs and magazines from the stores of history and religion adds a certain confusion that waylays the teacher of religion at unguarded moments. A mystery has become a murder novel. When we refer to the death story of Jesus and the temple's Inner Sanctum, the young see the specter of a radio program of this name rising before their eyes, a feature associated with liver pills of some special brand. Speaking of the apostles who were sent like sheep among the wolves produces sophisticated associations with the term "wolf." Napoleon and Elby and terms like "superman" have been drafted into becoming cheap comic-

book characters. This is a minor although degenerative symptom; but it points toward the potent rivalry of radio, screen, and press with our teaching.

The keen interest of youth in denominational differences and their opposition to sectarianism are interdependent and the frequently observed increase of loyalty to their own denomination may also be part of an uneven picture to be expected in these years. It is regrettable that the ignorance of their parents' generation in the matter of basic information on Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism supports the trend of neglecting the motivational importance of theological knowledge (in an elementary form) for ethical living. Incidentally it also too often proves dangerous, as the anti-Semitism surrounding modern youth more forcibly than a generation ago illustrates. Both ignorance and tolerance are the cousins of indifference, and the grand gesture of discarding denominational teaching and an elementary kind of theology as mere speculative moonshine appeals greatly to some fifteen-year-olds. But Protestantism, at this moment, must continue with its renewed effort at bringing out in clear relief the framework within which we can all agree and—disagree. The teacher of religion ought to be equipped with sound historical and theological information as well as to endeavor genuine tolerance for himself.

Baron von Hügel, leading British scholar and mystic, said once that most of the religion of adolescents consists in arguments. This speculative tendency is a healthy countertrait to their passion for information. Both may, as we know, assume bothersome proportions in the most promising youngster. After two hours of intense discussion on all conceivable matters, an intelligent girl of sixteen asked discreetly "just one more question," and confronted the minister with the demand, "Please tell me, what is the universe for?" That may be exasperating, but, after all, her thinking touched upon a most exciting problem.

THEIR MISSION TO US

Adolescents may derive more excitement from discovering questions within themselves than from some of the answers they get. They are as thrilled as the proverbial Arab in the hot desert who sees a spring of water in his own tent. Naturally, their reactions differ greatly in their individual situations. The varied rhythms of boys and girls, city youth as compared with country contemporaries, and the social stratifica-

tions enter into the picture and often determine it. But all adolescents have their function in society as a reminder of the radical changes taking place everywhere.

The opinion that each generation has the adolescents it deserves is too mechanistic. Such finality may apply to political life, but it is more in keeping with our faith to trust each generation's peculiar genius in which the critique of yesterday and the aspirations of tomorrow meet in a design that is beyond human verdict. Some adolescents think they don't have the kind of parents they deserve; such mutual pleasantries are banal and unproductive. Without the adolescents' indignation and impatience, their fervent dreams as well as their anger, their sensitiveness to all human issues as well as their exuberance, the corrosive processes of life would lack a salutary corrective. The old generation will have to heed their challenge and realize that the competition is on for the possession of their soul. Psychology is ready to supply a practical orientation that Christian teaching often forgets to give. It is the same with art and music. Their genius for transmitting and expressing the twilight moods of youth afford a sense of harmony and balance at which religious services ought to aim regularly. But greater issues arise before them than personal orientation and balance. Many ikons on the walls of Russian homes have been replaced by the portraits of Lenin and Stalin, which obviously give Russia's youth more of a purpose than Frank Sinatra and Hedy Lamarr may hold for young Americans.

The crisis in regard to prayer needs the common search of adults and youth for original and honest prayer of the individual and the congregation. The fads of astrology, wearing amulettes, and the ouija boards are waiting to lead them astray in their search for life's ultimate designs. Calling upon these for spiritual strength appears to many adolescents less incongruous than to call upon God. "I feel like a fool when I pray" is a not uncommon remark coming from adolescents. Are we straining the point too much when we think we hear in it a modern version of the disciple's demand, "Lord, teach us to pray"? Perhaps here again, the ways of indirect communication in sharing with them our common doubts and our adult search may be just as helpful as the few assurances we may be able to transmit.

Ten years from now, the adolescent will live in a historic setting as yet unknown to any of us. There is no static generation of adolescents. At any moment, numbers of them pass silently into adulthood and the

children of yesterday join their ranks that have no clearly circumscribed status. But somehow, we always sense their encouraging or disturbing presence. They will not permit us to remain neutral. They are the impatient fugitives from "the sweet shy bloom of infancy," perpetually in a hurry, and they live, as passengers in a waiting room, mentally in the future. As yet, they can hardly recognize the laws of their being that are among the mysteries of all life. But once the beauty and hazards of these years have passed, we invariably become aware of their mark on our own and our fellow men's future which they have made for all time to come.

From
"For the Time Being; A Christmas Oratorio"

W. H. AUDEN

For the garden is the only place there is, but you will not find it
Until you have looked for it everywhere and found nowhere that is not
a desert;
The miracle is the only thing that happens, but to you it will not be
apparent,
Until all events have been studied and nothing happens that you cannot
explain;
And life is the destiny you are bound to refuse until you have consented
to die.

AND because of his visitation, we may no longer desire God as if he were lacking: our redemption is no longer a question of pursuit but of surrender to him who is always and everywhere present. Therefore at every moment we pray that, following him, we may depart from our anxiety into his peace.

*Random House, 1944. Used by permission of the publisher.

The Promise of His Coming*

RAYMOND F. SMITH

This author holds that the primitive Christian hope and expectancy can be maintained today. Biblical study yields an eternally valid interpretation.

THE SWIFTLY moving course of human life during the last decade and a half has brought to a crisis the fundamental differences of world view and deep-seated perplexities that have seethed in men's minds since the beginning of recorded history. About 1920 the world seemed to be approaching an era of unexampled prosperity. Everything apparently pointed toward the realization of that "one far-off divine event, to which the whole creation moves." A war had been fought to "make the world safe for democracy." But war aggravates rather than solves the problems that plague mankind. The fond hopes of the twenties gave way to economic depression and the disillusionments of the thirties. The world, with the exception of a shortsighted United States Senate, had seen in the League of Nations the solution to the problem of national sovereignty. Now that League has taken its place in the graveyard of disappointed idealism. Once again the great democracies have fought to make the world free—this time from want and fear, and to insure freedom of speech and freedom of worship. The hopes of the twenties were revived and became the hopes of the early forties. The United Nations stirred the spark of idealism in men's hearts and again placed a star of hope in a dark sky.

Now it appears that the hopes revived during the second World War will become the disillusionments of the late forties and fifties. The nations that won the war appear destined to lose the peace. We, who so glibly claim the role of moral leadership in a tottering world, give no indication of our capacity for that leadership. We have not made even a gesture toward disarmament, nor have we hinted a willingness to surrender one iota of national sovereignty. One blushes even to mention our behavior in the handling of the atom bomb. Famine once again stalks the earth and its devastating effects will continue for years. The

*A Religious Club Contest Article, read in its original form before the Providence Baptist Theological Circle on March 13, 1945, while the author was pastor of the First Baptist Church, East Providence, R. I.

sense of insecurity is widespread and the seeds of future wars seem to have been sown much more widely and deeply than during the years immediately following the first World War.

In the face of the present world situation, can we continue to pray: "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"? It would appear that the heart of man is fundamentally wrong and stands in need of a complete transformation. Is there any possibility that through the ordinary course of preaching the gospel, spreading the doctrines of the righteousness of God, the love of Christ and the duties of man to his fellows, this world can ever be saved? Or must there come some cataclysmic change into the course of nature and society so as to make it possible for men to serve God and love one another?

These are very practical questions. If in the long run the preaching of the gospel is to reach only a few, if all the efforts to make its truths take hold upon society are futile, then our duty as Christians is to seek those few and worry as little as possible about society. If this present creation is hopeless and must be transformed before the will of God can be done on earth, then our task as Christians will be one thing. It will be quite another if we can believe that God is able to save men, and enough of them, and save them so thoroughly, that in spite of our present physical limitations we can construct a saved society on this earth, a society in which—in a true though necessarily limited sense—the will of God will be done "as it is in heaven." These two contradictory views of the workings of God in his world we are to discuss in this paper. *The path toward a solution must lie through historical study.*

I. THE ANCIENT JEWISH HOPE

Unless we know something of the national hope of ancient Israel the Jewish people will remain to us a riddle. We must turn to this hope, then, as manifestly the first step toward a solution of our problem of the coming of the kingdom and the King who shall rule that kingdom. As we follow through the centuries we shall find our way to firmer ground for the understanding of Jesus and the hope of his coming.

The expectation of the early Hebrews centered around the "Day of Yahweh," the Hebrew equivalent of the Second Coming and the Day of Judgment. The formulation of such a hope was the fruit of long years of accumulated customs and thought moulds. Its early history has been well summarized by Dr. Chester McCown:

Out of primitive superstitious fear, the sense of dependence upon higher powers, the desire for happiness, there grew up among the Hebrews, as among other nations, certain myths explaining the origin of the world and the course of its future history. With these there combined the Hebrew national theology, resulting in the time of the monarchy, in a firm hope that eventually Israel would triumph over all her foes through the mighty intervention of her God. This hope was clad in language which may be designated as apocalyptic, representing the theophany which was to usher in the new day as a natural catastrophe, or series of catastrophes, in which the elements should fight for Israel. It was thoroughly supernatural in that it represented Yahweh as working contrary to the ordinary course of nature. . . . It was eschatological, not merely in that it dealt with the future, but also that it described the blissful era of peace and prosperity which Israel should enjoy under the protection of Yahweh.¹

The great prophets of Israel "brought the Day of Yahweh down out of the twilight of mythology into the daylight of history."² They made it a matter of morality rather than of unthinking patriotism. It was to be a time of punishment. It was to be a vindication, not of Israel, but of Yahweh, a revelation not of their greatness but of his power and righteousness. With the development of monotheism came the belief that Yahweh would discriminate between the righteous and the wicked of other nations also, and that the good, of whatever nation, would share in the glories of the new age.

In their efforts to peer beyond the great catastrophe into the new era which should follow, two contrasting, but not contradictory, ideas came to the surface. Over against the hope of a rejuvenation of the Davidic line there stands the conception of God alone as King in Israel. Thus the prophets prepared the way for belief in God as *an immanent spiritual presence* guiding the affairs of history and filling the hearts of men.

In the development of eschatology during the six centuries following the exile we discover great changes. Under the influence of Babylonian and Persian cosmologies, Jewish apocalypticism united with the Gnostic idea that matter as such is evil. A good God could not rule an evil world. Therefore, this earth must be purified and transformed by a cosmic miracle, or it must be destroyed. The apocalypticist looked out upon a world with an ever-widening horizon. The earliest apocalypticists spoke in terms of Israel and her neighbors. But as time went on the "Day of Yahweh" came to embrace literally the whole world. At the same time the individual stepped out of the chorus to take a solo part. His personal salvation and his personal resurrection became matters of

¹ *The Promise of His Coming*, pp. 58f.

² *Ibid.*, p. 87.

profound importance. Consequently there was a tendency to think of the future in more transcendental terms, to make the national hope spiritual and otherworldly. There was also a tendency to systematize the apocalyptic doctrines into dogmas, but there was no single system or point of view dominating the Jewish nation. Four different views regarding the messiah appear in Jewish literature:

1. In a large number of apocalyptic works he does not appear at all.
2. In the original *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, written during the height of the Maccabean successes, the messiah is to come from the tribe of Levi, since the Maccabeans belonged to that priestly tribe.
3. With the disappointment of this hope, later interpolations were made in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* claiming the messiah again from Judah, a view that became dominant from the first century on. The popular view, no doubt, made this Davidic messiah a thoroughly temporal conqueror. But a spiritually militant anointed one of the lineage of David is described in the Psalms of Solomon.
4. In place of this greater Son of David, human, but divinely ideal and sinless, the *Similitudes of Enoch* put a pre-existent, heavenly Son of Man. The title is borrowed directly from Daniel 7:13ff, but what is there only a personification or an angelic representative of the people of Israel is here a distinct personality.

This unique conception of the Messiah as the Son of Man, interpreting the Danielic personification or angelic representative of Israel as a real personality, second only to God in glory and power, is one of the most interesting developments in all pre-Christian apocalyptic literature, because of the use Jesus made of it and its contribution of the idea of pre-existence to the Christian conception of the person of Christ.

Therefore, we face a complex problem when we try to determine to what degree any one of these shades of apocalypticism was adopted by Jesus and the early Christian writers. We shall expect to find that the early Christian hope is not simple and single, but multiform, like that from which it sprang.

II. JESUS AND APOCALYPTICISM

The religious situation of Jesus' day was much more complicated than many have been accustomed to think. The *orthodoxy* of Jesus' day was expressed in the legalism of the Scribes and Pharisees. The Pharisee was the ideal Jew, even to the multitude whom he despised. The Scribes and Pharisees believed in the coming of the kingdom *in God's*

own good time. It was a matter with which they had nothing to do, except that the keeping of the Law made one fit for a place in it.

It was this apocalyptic movement that was the chief social and religious *heterodoxy* of Jesus' day. Not that it was then a "sect." It was rather a tendency, like modern premillennialism. It is sometimes remarked that practically every known evangelist in America accepts vigorously the belief in a speedy coming of Christ in visible fashion to the earth to establish the millennial kingdom. That is perfectly natural. The ancient apocalyptists were the enthusiasts, the revivalists of their day. In contrast to the self-centered, self-righteous ecclesiasticism of the Pharisees, they viewed the religious situation with alarm. They believed in the Law, as did the orthodox party, but they went farther. They lashed out against the evils of the times and let loose their woes against *everything* and *everybody*. Political and social discontent among the Jews had no way to express itself except in apocalypticism.

The question therefore rises, what was the attitude of Jesus toward these outstanding movements of his day? Here were two ideals of life, two philosophies of history, two views of the universe—not mutually exclusive and easily differentiated as viewed by men of that generation, but inextricably interwoven and confused, so that the modern student, with all the history of two thousand years before his eyes and the verdict of posterity to help him, finds it difficult to disentangle the threads. Was he able to see through the mists of partisan controversy and make plain to his contemporaries a consistent and unified world view?

From a study of the teachings of Jesus one comes to the conclusion that there were two contradictory elements only partly synthesized in the Gospel records. There was the apocalyptic element, which to most minds connoted a certain external, mechanical scheme of the future, and a prophetic element, which was spiritual and internal as well as social. The fact that down through the centuries there have persisted, side by side, two views of the future outcome of his work, one millennarian, the other social and spiritual, suggests that there may have been inconsistency even within the teaching of Jesus.

III. THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN HOPE

When one turns from Jesus to his immediate followers, the profound influence of Jewish apocalypticism is at once apparent. It seems evident that all of them had been firm believers in this apocalyptic. Sympathy

with the poor and oppressed, the expectation of a tremendous reversal of conditions which should overthrow the rich and powerful and elevate the weak and humble, the certainty that wickedness would be judged and punished and righteousness recognized and rewarded, the faith that all this was to be wrought by supernaturalistic, catastrophic interference from heaven, and the vivid confidence that it was to happen *in the immediate future*—all these outstanding characteristics of the primitive Christian hope mark it as derived directly from apocalypticism.

There are various traits that distinguish this early Christian hope from the usual forms of Jewish eschatology. Little is said about the world growing worse. Sins indeed are seen and rebuked. But the end is so near, the need of repentance so pressing, the opportunity of forgiveness and the hope of salvation so glorious, that there is no time for evils to grow worse and worse, no inclination to paint a gloomy picture of the present. So vivid is their faith, so sustaining is their hope, that one cannot speak of pessimism in connection with those early Christians. They were living in the last days. Of that they were sure.

The entire thought of Paul—and that means much of the foundation of our Christian thinking—is dominated by the expectation of the speedy coming of Christ. This expectation he finds expressed in the frequent celebration of the Lord's Supper, which shows forth the death of Christ "till he come." It gives character to his ethics, leading him to desire for himself and for his disciples freedom from those family cares which may render their service less efficient during the short time that remains before the coming of the Lord. It is ever present in his prayers. In his fears lest he himself fail to reach the goal, he commits himself to the Lord who is able to keep that which he has entrusted to him against that day; in fatherly anxiety for those converts who are to be his glory and crown at Christ's coming, he prays that the good work begun in him may be perfected unto the day of Jesus Christ.

Whether Paul revised his ideas concerning the second coming of Christ as he neared the end of his ministry is a debatable question.

In the much-discussed fifth chapter of Second Corinthians, where Paul associates this hope with a new body to be put on after death, some interpreters find evidence of his abandoning the former expectation of being present at the second coming of Christ. Hence the life immediately after death was brought into the foreground of his thinking.

During the course of Paul's ministry small units of Christian be-

lievers were established in many parts of the civilized world. But after his death a recession set in and they became bewildered. And their bewilderment was due largely to the eschatology of the early followers of Jesus and the early preaching of Paul. They had been taught that God would shortly pass a gigantic miracle and wipe out the kingdoms of this earth in a mighty cataclysm. Jesus would appear upon the clouds and establish a new order of life—the kingdom of God on earth. That was their hope and their expectation. Now a hundred years had passed, and still no sign of any such consummation was visible. In Second Peter we catch the echo of their disappointment. Hope deferred had begun to wear thin. “Where is the promise of his coming?” we read, “for from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”³

About the turn of the first century after Christ it appeared that the fires of persecution would destroy the church. The trial seemed beyond its strength. The end of the age, the salvation of the saints so long expected and promised, had not come. It was as if God had forgotten them. At this juncture, a Jewish Christian, who was perfectly familiar with the apocalyptic literature of his race and fully persuaded that the woes and distresses of the time portended the speedy realization of the Christian hope, wrote the Book of Revelation, the New Testament apocalypse “par excellence,” clothing his faith in the rugged pictorial language of apocalyptic mythology. The writer believed himself to be living in the last days. Though the Christian Church was undergoing terrible persecutions and sufferings, there was still worse ahead; so he wrote to picture to his fellow believers the glorious deliverance that was to come when the climax should be reached and Christ should return to set up on earth his thousand-year reign. It is a thoroughly Jewish piece of work. Every detail can be matched in heathen mythology or Jewish apocalypticism, except that the Messiah is Jesus Christ, and the members of the kingdom are the new Israel, the Christian Church, the people who have “come out of great tribulation,” who have “washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.”⁴

IV. THREE MILLENNIA OF WAITING

For three thousand years men have been waiting for the millennium.

³ II Peter 3:4.

⁴ Revelation 7:14.

Since before the prophets, nine hundred or a thousand years before the birth of Christ, the Hebrew ancestors of the Christian faith had looked for the appearance, in some sense, of God as their Saviour. We have followed the development of this hope down to the second century of the Christian era. We discovered at the beginning a popular prehistoric faith based on current mythology and nationalistic theology. The earlier prophets tried to reinterpret the popular idea of the Day of Yahweh and transform it from a selfish patriotic hope into a vital motive for social ethics and spiritual religion. The postexilic prophets and apocalypticists, while maintaining the ethical note and in some ways extending the spiritual implications of what now came to be called the judgment or consummation of the age, nevertheless partially lost the social and historical content of the prophetic conception and returned to the pre-prophetic popular religion. They developed also definite schemes or programs of future events and a peculiar type of literature marked by characteristic forms and figures of speech.

New Testament eschatology developed out of Jewish apocalypticism. Three points must be remembered regarding the relation of New Testament religion to this problem:

1. Christianity was more than an apocalyptic movement.
2. Christianity was thoroughly heterodox and enthusiastic, the true child of Jewish apocalypticism, completely imbued with faith in a speedy turn of affairs which should usher in a new age.
3. The doctrine of the last things in the New Testament is anything but uniform and consistent. Among first-generation Christians we find the liveliest hopes of the speedy return of Christ in power to inaugurate the new age, the reign of God. This expectation was greatly enhanced at the time of the fall of Jerusalem. It began to ebb in the two following decades, but blazed up again about the time the Christians were being persecuted under Domitian. Thereafter it ceased to be a living hope, at least in the minds of most Christians. Except as circumstances similar to those that gave it birth repeatedly called it back to life, it became a dead doctrine, a part of the faith once delivered to the saints.

In general one may say that the doctrine of the Second Coming has run like an underground stream throughout the history of Christianity. When occasion arose, especially during persecutions and unusual political disturbances, great famines, pestilences, catastrophes in nature, or periods

of war, it would come to the surface and for awhile become a mighty river. When the circumstances that called it forth changed, the people, disappointed in their hopes, abandoned the doctrine as erroneous, until a new generation arose that had forgotten. We see these flood tides of apocalypticism in the Apostolic Brethren of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in the Taborites of the fifteenth century, in the Anabaptists of the Reformation, in some of the Quakers in the seventeenth century in England, in the Darbyites, the Irvingites, the Millerites, and the Mormons in the early nineteenth century. During the first World War, and immediately after its conclusion, much apocalyptic interest was manifest. A revival of interest is apparent during the present crisis.

V. THE MODERN CHRISTIAN'S DILEMMA

Perhaps no belief filled so large a place in the horizon of the early Christian's thinking as that in the second coming of Christ. It is difficult for us in this age to conceive of the power and vividness of this early Christian hope. With one notable exception, every writer in the New Testament seems fully to expect that Jesus will return on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. Large sections of the earliest Gospels dwell on the thought. Paul mentions it in nearly every letter. Later writers are almost impatient in urging patience upon those who are beginning to be weary of waiting. One of the watchwords of the early Christian brotherhood consisted of the Aramaic words *Marana tha*, "O Lord, come!" The Book of Revelation closes with the words, "He who bears this testimony says, 'Even so; I am coming very soon.' Amen, Lord Jesus, come!" How incongruous it seems that this fundamental doctrine of the first Christians, though nominally accepted, is practically neglected by the greater portion of modern believers and would be scarcely missed if it were removed from the scheme of Christian belief.

The whims and freaks of ancient apocalypticism and modern adventism during these three thousand years of waiting have driven the great majority of Christians into complete indifference to the whole subject. It is outside the thought-world of the modern thinker. Are we, then, simply to discard the doctrine of the second coming of Christ?

Can we really be *Christian* and dismiss as an unimportant fantasy, or perhaps as a troublesome overemphasis or fanaticism, a belief that was the very center of Jesus' thinking and which alone gave point to his death and a foundation for the primitive church? Should not the

very importance of the role this great doctrine played in the life of the early church cause us to pause and consider its intrinsic value for us? If it is found to have none, loyalty to our intellectual and religious thinking should cause us to drop it. We cannot continue to maintain it because it was once useful, as we do the buttons on our sleeves. But if we must discard it we shall be perilously near discarding Jesus. What can we do with this troublesome but insistent teaching? For over nineteen hundred years men have prayed, "Amen, Lord Jesus, come!" And we today after years of devastating war, winters of famine and summers of pestilence, as social unrest and industrial disturbances multiply, seek an answer to the question: "What does the promise of his coming mean to us in the twentieth century?"

The doctrine is of interest not only because it played so large a part in the faith of the primitive church and in the teaching of Jesus himself; nor merely because so many earnest Christians have been misled by its extravagances and made barren and unfruitful; it has a much wider significance. The promise of his coming is the Christian formulation of a longing that seems as old and widespread as the race. It is the deep-seated yearning of the human heart to see evil eventually punished and destroyed so that man can again live in purity and happiness. The restless, untiring efforts of man to subdue the earth and make it a better place to live in, from the time of the peasant in Egypt, through the social revolution in Russia, until now, all testify that man must strive forward to something better. Does the promise of his coming offer fulfilment for all these hopes and aspirations?

VI. THE JOHANNINE ANSWER

For an answer to these questions we turn again to the Bible, where we find the outline of a clear interpretation that contains the fundamental truth of the apocalyptic view and also is in harmony with the modern view of God and the world. Toward the end of the second generation of Christians, the "Beloved Disciple" came to a mature realization of certain truths which had been hidden from many of his fellow believers. Who the "Beloved Disciple" was matters little for our present discussion. The point is that here in the Fourth Gospel we reach the highest point in the New Testament, an interpretation of the inner meaning of Jesus' person and teaching which rises sun-crowned above all the lesser peaks of New Testament literature.

Concerning this answer to our problem Dr. McCown has this to say:

The quality of this Johannine answer is thrown into brilliant relief by contrast with that of Second Peter. The latter knows no honest doubters, only mockers, and he answers them by threatening them with the mythological dogma of a world conflagration. The Johannine answer comes from the heart that has had communion with the spirit of God. It does not threaten punishment, but promises power. It is a joyful answer, to be apprehended by the faith that overcomes the world.⁵

Few chapters in the New Testament have caused the Christian heart more difficulties than the thirteenth of Mark and the twenty-fourth of Matthew. When we turn to the Gospel of John we find that to all intents and purposes the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters replace, in the outline of events, those troublesome chapters in Mark and Matthew—and probably no part of the New Testament has brought more comfort to the Christian heart than these three chapters in the Fourth Gospel. When once they are read in place of the thirteenth chapter of Mark, a flood of light is thrown on the problem we have been studying. "Yet a little while" was the motto of the early Christians. It is mentioned in Second Peter. It receives much emphasis in Hebrews. Here in the Gospel of John it is happily echoed and reinterpreted. Jesus is coming again, *in a little while, not on the clouds, but in the hearts of believers*. Only the spiritual Christ who is always to be present in the world can say, "Remain in me, as I remain in you." To the Christian of A.D. 110 who read the Gospel of John, Christ had already come in the Holy Spirit, the Helper, the Comforter. He needed no longer to wait "a little while."

The writer of the Gospel of John substitutes a spiritual judgment for the spectacular one usually deduced from the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew. The divine judgment is not external but internal; it is not technical but moral; it is not forensic but natural; it is not future, but present. This interpretation of the judgment is possible only because of a new, spiritual interpretation of the messianic victory over the powers of evil. Jesus in his death has cast out the prince of this world, drawn men away from their former allegiance to evil, transferred their loyalty to himself.

Here in the Fourth Gospel one finds no moral or spiritual pessimism. Jesus' very death means the overthrow of Satan and all his

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 209.

hosts. For it makes possible the coming Comforter (perhaps better translated Strengthened), the Spirit of Truth, who will guide the disciple into all truth and convict the world of righteousness, of sin and of judgment. "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do."⁶ Here no limits are set to the power of God. Christ's kingdom is not *of* this world, because it is to be brought in not by physical and material means but by spiritual forces working in and through the hearts of men. Yet it is *in* the world. The disciples are not to be taken out of the world, but are to be saved from its evil.

This is a most practical doctrine. It is but a consistent development of the Pauline idea of the victorious life in Christ, made possible by a faith that bears the fruits of the spirit—the social fruits of love, joy, peace, good temper, kindness, generosity, fidelity, gentleness, self-control. Paul says, "The victory is ours, thank God. He makes it ours by our Lord Jesus Christ." Both Paul and John have their footing squarely on the teaching of their Master who taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done *on earth*."

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Since there is so much in apocalyptic that is weak and even puerile, why has an overruling Providence allowed it such a prominent place in the writings of our faith? Or to phrase it a little differently, how does it come about that through all the centuries it has kept such a hold on the best and most sincere saints, both in Judaism and in Christianity? The answer seems plain and should be spoken with all emphasis: because there is so much in it that satisfies the deepest needs of the human heart. And that is another way of saying it contains great fundamental truths. The weaknesses lie only in the rough outside burr which hides the rich kernel inside. Why does God allow us to go groping for the truth instead of revealing it clearly? We cannot fully answer such a question. But the answer lies somewhere in the realm of our capabilities. Our eyes do not like the glaring black and white of an overexposed photograph. Our minds are not capable of grasping truth cleanly and squarely, completely separating it from falsehood. Except in such small matters as "two and two make four," falsehood is always

⁶ John 14:12.

mixed with truth. The Old Testament religion was imperfect and inadequate, but the Law was the teacher that led men to Christ. Ancient Jewish apocalypticism and modern premillennialism are imperfect, but both have kept alive vital truths. In these systems there is a vital hopefulness, an inspiring enthusiasm, a feeling of tension which has made great undertakings possible.

The social-spiritual view we are advocating as the Johannine answer to the problem of the tension between good and evil in the world eliminates the objectionable features of apocalyptic—its pessimism, its determinism, its externalism, and its literalism. It preserves the valuable elements, often in a form that enhances their power. For the coming of the Messiah on the clouds at the end of the age, it substitutes a present and continual coming of the eternal, personal Christ in the hearts of men and in social institutions. Instead of an eventual vindication of righteousness from without the world and man, it envisions a gradual, progressive victory of the right due to its own inherent power. It maintains all the social dissatisfaction and wistful longing for a better era that marked ancient apocalyptic, but it looks for social regeneration through the operation of spiritual forces that God has implanted and still directs within the individual and society. The social-spiritual view does not undervalue the apocalyptic expectation of catastrophic judgment, but reads its great truth into a saner view of social evolution. From the mountaintop of its high experience with God it discerns his presence and his reign in a thousand signs of the times.

To feel that Christ is here, that he is leading the hosts of righteousness to ultimate victory, that "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet," means comfort for the time of trial and strength for the hour of battle. It is a vital, victorious faith to believe that Christ has never left the world, and that more and more he is being enthroned in the souls of men and the institutions of society. Whereas the apocalyptic view is mechanical, this social-spiritual view welds the catastrophic and the so-called normal into an organic universe. Instead of proclaiming that Jesus is coming at some definite or indefinite date in the future, we cry, "The kingdom of God is at hand, the day of the Lord is upon us. Quit you like men. Be strong."

Edinburgh, 1901

PAUL D. MOODY

The son of Dwight L. Moody describes vividly the galaxy of great personalities who flourished at Edinburgh and Glasgow in his student days.

IN THE AUTUMN of 1901, my mother and I were living in lodgings on Melville Street, Edinburgh, and I attended New College—the United Free Seminary on the Mound. Exactly why, after this lapse of years, I cannot say. It was felt by her children that a change was indicated for my mother; and since there were many friends in Edinburgh, it seemed not a bad idea. It had the added advantage that it could be combined with an opportunity for further study for me. Yet, why Edinburgh, with its climate which Robert Louis Stevenson declared to be a meteorological purgatory, is hard to say, since her health was a consideration. The Scotch are a hardy race to stand the climate. This we had on good authority, for directly across the street from us was one who knew. We saw him starting out every morning in an open carriage on his round of calls, for he was a doctor. We saw him also at the head of his pew in church, for he was an elder at Free St. George's. He was a striking figure with thick white hair worn en brosse and high color and great Roman nose, and was no less a person than Dr. Joseph Bell who had, by his powers of deduction, suggested to the young medical student in his classes, Conan Doyle, the famous figure of Sherlock Holmes. When we were advised to call Dr. Bell in for my mother, she commented on his open carriage and he made the remark then, that the Scots were a hardy race and had to be, for the climate killed off all but the strong and they grew harder resisting it.

Most Americans see Edinburgh in the summer when the nights are short and the twilights long and the sky is delicate above Arthur's seat and the Castle. They carry away pleasant impressions of this Queen City of the north with its quaint streets, and closes, particularly that winding up from Holyrood, rich in story, to the Castle, past John Knox's house and the Cathedral. Or in the newer part of the city, Princess Street and the Gardens replacing the little loch where once they threw witches. If they were witches and floated, you remember they were

taken out and hanged or burned. If not, and they were innocent, they sank, which was just too bad, but they had the somewhat belated comfort of knowing as they sank, or in another world, that their persecutors were wrong.

But relatively few Americans know it in the winter. Then it is another matter, and not to be ignored. The last time I was there was in a January. I had taken a night train, and on arrival was making my way to the house where I was being entertained; and it occurred to me to wonder if I was arriving too early. I looked at my watch and could not see to read it, though I was out on the street. I struck a match and read the time. It was just 9:00 A.M., but still dark as midnight. By way of contrast I went back in memory to a previous visit one day in late May when under the smoke-stained and dirty glass roof of a train shed as I waited, I had noted the time as midnight without any artificial light. True, there was daylight saving, but it was light enough at midnight. Surely it is a city of contrasts.

But this is not a travelogue. It is rather a recalling of some of the men a student was privileged to sit under long ago. The statement, "There were giants in the earth in those days," was made long, long ago; and it has been repeated in every generation, as Kipling knew when he wrote "The King." Nevertheless, even if in some cases the haze of time may lend a certain magnitude to their stature, I know I have not seen their like since.

As a special student I enrolled at New College. Americans were welcome there and all the more so at that time, for the memory of Henry Sloane Coffin was very fresh and he had left a deep impression, Marcus Dods saying that no student at New College had ever been more popular in Dods's time or exerted a wider influence. He had built up a high standard for Americans and raised expectations bound to be disappointed often enough. There were a few other Americans besides myself and one or two Englishmen.

The merger between the United Presbyterian and the Free Church had just taken place, and Dr. Rainy, who had had such a share in engineering this, was still principal of New College. I attended none of his lectures, and, beyond being a guest at a rather formal dinner at his house, saw little of him. My principal contact was with Dr. Marcus Dods, and I took everything of his I could, besides availing myself of his guidance in reading I was trying to do. I realize that he is con-

sidered quite outmoded now, and even then, he was a little prone to break lances with ideas of an earlier day. There were few light touches about his lectures. He talked in a rather high voice, with his massive head usually on one side. Like Rainy he was an extraordinarily handsome man. He usually lectured with his arms folded in front of him, reading carefully and never, never a gesture. There is a story to the effect that his close friend, Henry Drummond, once took him to task for this and told him to break loose and use his hands. Dods took this to heart, for he was a most humble man, his existence as a "stickit" minister (called to no church for eleven years) having had its effect on him; and shortly after, in one sermon, he thrust his arm above his head. It is said he kept it there for the balance of the sermon, not seeing a proper place to bring it down. It is possible this is a legend, but it is a legend entirely in keeping with the man. It was Drummond who engineered his appointment to the New Testament chair, and I believe it took all the matchless charm of which he was possessed to do this. Matthew Arnold was Dods's *bête noir*, and he never could resist a fling at him. I remember Dods dealing with that passage where Arnold, questioning Miracles, asked if what he, Arnold, wrote would be entitled to greater credence if *as* he wrote, his pen should turn into a penwiper. Dods remarked in that rather piping voice, which was such a contrast to his physical massiveness, that some of Arnold's friends must wish that his pen had turned into a penwiper before he wrote such a silly thing.

The last time I saw him, I went to his house to say good-by. His maid said he was at leisure, but I hesitated to enter his study, as I heard his voice in conversation. But she insisted, and when I knocked and entered, I found him talking very soberly to an impertinent-looking wire-haired terrier who was answering him after his kind. The attempt was being made at that time to have George Adam Smith up for trial in the Assembly for his recent *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, the Lyman Beecher Lectures of 1899, a movement which happily came to nothing. I ventured that in America we were apt to go through the same sort of thing a generation later. Dr. Dods declared that "your great country" was far too sensible to ever do that, but I recalled this when more than twenty years later the battle was raging here.

The glory of New College was, of course, A. B. Davidson. Not at that time being trained in Hebrew, I listened only to his lectures in

English, and I heard the last of these he delivered, for he died very suddenly that week. He had been, as every one knows, the teacher of both W. Robertson Smith and George Adam Smith. It was often asked why, when his students had managed to get into such hot water for their advanced views, he, their teacher, had never been attacked in the Assembly. Robertson Smith is even said to have pointed dramatically to the direction of New College during his trial in 1876 and declared that nothing he had written or taught was otherwise than what he had learned there as a student. This was undoubtedly because Davidson never made a popular appeal and shunned it, and also because all who came under him felt the genuine piety and spirituality of the man. There was deep feeling as well as learning in his handling of the Old Testament, never arid pedantry. His lecture on Saul, for example, was famous, and students would leave other classrooms and flock to his if it was suspected that he had reached a point in the course where this lecture would come in. So he deliberately shifted this lecture to irregular times, disliking numbers.

He did not consider himself a preacher; he could only with the greatest difficulty be persuaded to preach, and that rarely, and he had the true scholar's instinctive recoil from what was popular. We always believed, perhaps on slight evidence, that he felt that George Adam Smith was more a preacher than a scholar; for one day when George Adam Smith was announced as delivering a lecture in Edinburgh on "Hebrew Poetry," Dr. Davidson alluded to Hebrew Poetry as "whatever that is." He is said to have remarked in his high-pitched voice that there was nothing new in *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, just published, "save its evangelical fervor." He would not agree during his lifetime to the publishing of any of his more popular essays; *Called of God* and *Biblical Essays* were not issued until after he died. I remember him for his great kindliness, a twinkle in his eye, and a slight and well-controlled impishness, of which I was seldom conscious in his colleagues. To the student unprepared and attempting to bluff, after he had been allowed to flounder to a standstill, he remarked that there is no a priori knowledge of Hebrew. When there was, as seldom happened, a disturbance in the classroom, he would look up and smilingly reassure the class with the remark, "It is only Mr. McTavish." And that was enough. He was gentle, but shrewd. He is said to have replied in broad Scots dialect to a bluestocking who

asked if he did not like intellectual women, "Nae, I like the sully prutty ones the best." It is the sort of story, which, authentic or not, conveys a picture or impression of the man.

He was never married; and he looked like a Scots farmer. Indeed, he might have been mistaken for his brother, who was one, and whom I saw at the funeral, a funeral at which there was a tremendous gathering of the theological brains of Great Britain.

The faculty was not made up entirely of Davidsons, alas! There was one whom it is kinder to veil with anonymity. He had been appointed in the far-off days of the Darwinian conflict to the chair of Natural Science, a post created to combat the heresy; but the chair had long outlived its usefulness, if it ever had any. The course was compulsory and the students loathed it, and did all they could by pure rowdyism to make its continuance or the continuance of the occupant a matter of investigation by the General Assembly. But the old man would not complain, lest the Assembly investigate. The students nearly succeeded once when two of them, one afterwards a distinguished man, had played catch at the back of the room during the lecture, with a petrified cocoanut, a part of the equipment. One had thrown the cocoanut a trifle too hard, and the other refused to catch it. The wretched thing crashed through the window and fell four stories, cracking a flagstone in the pavement and nearly braining Principal Rainy who was passing by. Then there *was* the investigation which the old man had dreaded; but the forces of reaction were too strong, and he was allowed to go on. I had heard so much about the class that I visited it one day, which was a grave mistake, for a new face in the classroom was the signal for concerted effort and real show. It began with locking the poor old professor out; and we could hear him mumbling and fumbling futilely with the doorknob and begging to be let in. He was, at last, but the class had got off to a bad start. During the hour practically every member of the class left his seat to examine leisurely and solemnly a cupboard unhappily left unlocked, where specimens used in the lectures were stored. American colleges do not know what rowdyism is. I attended once a rectorial address given by that great proconsul, the aged Marquis of Dufferin and Ava, and not a word of his written speech did I hear, such was the constant uproar. In the life of Sir William Osler there is an account of the proceedings of the Scots students in connection with an election of a new rector. I have never seen or heard of any

action of American students even distantly approaching the behavior of the students of Scotland, and the theological students were as bad as the rest.

Perhaps the fact that such a man as Drummond had occupied a similar chair at Glasgow made the contrast of this superannuated old gentleman all the more unbearable. The rival seminary at Glasgow where I went the following year, was, it seemed to me, more alert. The principal there was Thomas Lindsay, the church historian; and the New Testament chair was held by Dr. Denney. Dr. Denney was in many ways a great contrast to Dr. Dods, but I cannot adequately express either my admiration or affection for him. He was one for whom nature did little and grace much. His face was forbidding and he was one of the dourest-looking individuals, a man who could say more in fewer words, and make those words take hold and bite. He was much more modern in his approach than Dods and much more daring, more scientific. By inclination he was a recluse, and the necessary social contacts with students, I believe, a sore trial to him. The social evenings he held infrequently were a trial to the students, too, for his guests felt every moment that he was longing devoutly to see the last of their backs going down the steps. He was not by habit a smoker, but on an evening of this kind, in a vain attempt to break the ice and put us at our ease, he would take a cigarette himself. Then it was amusing to watch his grim endurance and the awkwardness with which he held it gingerly, as if expecting an explosion but hoping for the best, and gently and timidly puffing at it with pursed lips.

I came to know him best when a couple of years later he stayed with us in this country for some weeks. Then on long visits he told me something of his struggle with himself. He always started out, he said, disliking people and only gradually overcame it in each individual case. But underneath this hard shell there was great tenderness and it was not unusual to find his voice choking and see his eyes misted at some passage which moved him greatly. Mrs. Denney was a wonderful contrast—cheerful, plump, and smiling. They had no children, and our elder daughter was a babe in arms that summer and they could have no greater pleasure than to be allowed to hold her. Having a camera, I took, as most young fathers do, numerous badly focused under- or over-exposed pictures, and many with the infant on the lap of either Dr. or Mrs. Denney. These, when developed, I sent to them, and after Mrs.

Denney's death I had a letter from Dr. Denney saying that they were the only pictures he possessed of his wife.

There is one incident which is so typical it should be told. As I was walking with the two of them one evening when they were staying with us, a certain name came up and Mrs. Denney began to sputter. It appeared that this individual had declared that Dr. Denney only allowed less than a dozen of the utterances of Jesus to have been authentic. This had hurt Dr. Denney sorely and infuriated Mrs. Denney. Among the passages which Dr. Denney was alleged to throw out was Matthew 11:28 and 29, "Come unto me," and this, claimed his critic, on the ground that Dr. Denney had never preached on it. With a broken voice Dr. Denney declared, "I have never been able to."

In striking contrast to Denney was George Adam Smith, for this was before he went to Aberdeen. Again as in the case of Denney, I saw more of Smith in this country, for I did not attend his lectures, again because of my lack of Hebrew. He was a guest at my mother's several times. The longest visit was when he was recovering from the attack of typhoid which overtook him in Cleveland. He preached his famous sermon on Esau at Northfield and my father, who heard him in New Haven on an earlier visit, thought him one of the greatest of the preachers of the day. My father also heard the Lyman Beecher Lectures and could not, for the life of him, understand, first why there was objection to them, and second, why any one who could preach that way bothered to lecture; it was in this connection that my father made his oft-quoted remark that it was a pity to tell people that there were two Isaiahs when so many did not know there was one.

Henry Drummond was, of course, dead by this time, but his memory lingered about the college at Lyndoch Place and his influence was still felt. Clark, the general factotum, business manager, and superintendent, never tired of talking of Drummond.

Before I return to Edinburgh—which perhaps I have no right to have left—mention should be made of two of my fellow students at Glasgow: Alexander Lindsay, who later became one of the successors of Benjamin Jowett at Balliol, and James Black, now at Free St. George's, Edinburgh. And while I speak of fellow students, mention should be made of two at Edinburgh, Hubert Simpson of London, and James Reid of Eastbourne, who has just resigned. It happens that three of the four mentioned were called to that Blue Ribbon pulpit of Scotland, Free

St. George's, of which I will say more. Simpson refused, as he had been brought up in that church and could not think of himself as following his uncle, Dr. Whyte; and Reid refused because of his handicap in his limited and peripheral vision. To me Reid is one of the most completely satisfying preachers to whom I have ever listened. I heard him well described as a "slight man blended of learning and fire," an apt description. James Black *did* go to St. George's, following John Kelman.

Looking back on those two years, it has always been with very deep gratitude, and for *this* reason: The transition was made from a very traditional and really fundamentalist position and background, one not only evangelical in the narrowest sense but also evangelistic to a great degree, to a more modern position—and this with an amazing lack of that sort of dislocation through which I saw so many like myself pass with difficulty and bitterness, and often loss. This seemed to be because the men under whom I sat, however outstanding their scholarship, were humble Christians before they were experts in any field, and we who listened to them were more impressed by what they *believed* than by what they *knew*. In this country I have met men who seemed more interested in clearing the ground than in erecting anything in its place when the ground was cleared, more concerned that one should understand what a passage does *not* mean, than what it *does*. I am aware that it is necessary to tear down false impressions before really constructive work can be done; but fifty years ago there often seemed a deal more interest in the work of demolition than the work of construction. I hope that happily this has changed, and I think that it may be in measure due to the influence of Scotland, an influence better for us, I believe, than some at any rate of the influences that we trace to German scholarship. This is a field where I am not qualified to talk, if I am at all, but I do repeat that in the classrooms of Edinburgh and Glasgow I found a warmth of feeling which I missed when I went on in this country. A rather fundamentalist minister from the South who was taking a sabbatical year abroad, often sat next to me in Davidson's lectures, and he whispered once that it seemed dreadful to see a white-haired man "destroying the Scripture." I sat in a daze, for it had seemed to me that what Davidson was doing was making the Old Testament mean a great deal more than it had ever meant before. Whatever students under George Adam Smith forgot or remembered of his work, they never forgot his almost fanatical reverence for the word of Scripture. You

could make all the noise within reason in his classroom while he lectured. But if he was reading the Bible, let everyone beware of as much as dropping a pencil. It was told of him that once when he had with very telling effect read a most apposite passage in relation to some matter under discussion in a gathering of ministers, they applauded. Smith was on his feet in an instant, white with anger, saying. "Gentlemen, gentlemen, we *accept* God's word. We do not *approve* it."

In this atmosphere of warm devotion I heard conclusions questioned I had never heard questioned before, and I was not jarred. It was mainly an atmosphere of affirmation and not negation, and the study was a means to an end, never an end in itself as I think I have seen it sometimes in American scholarship. The house wrecker is a useful and necessary factor in the life of a modern city. But he has never enjoyed the respect that a good architect does. So the man who clears the ground is necessary. But the effort is wasted unless the builder comes afterwards.

But the real glory of Edinburgh in those days was the pulpit of the city. And that was why it was so valuable for the theological student. Again it is possible that Time has magnified some of these figures, yet, I doubt if, since then, at any one time, any *one* city has had such an array. Certainly Glasgow did not—nor for that matter, London. I shall not attempt to catalogue the leading preachers, and I could not hear them all. On a Sunday you could take your choice of going to hear Cameron Lees at the Cathedral of St. Giles where long ago Jenny Geddes threw her stool at the preacher, registering disapproval in a manner now happily obsolete. Or you could go to St. Cuthbert's, where Adam Burnet now preaches, a pulpit then held by one affectionately known as Wee MacGregor, and by many looked upon as the most able preacher in the city. Or you could go and hear blind George Matheson. I was personally interested in Dr. J. Hood Wilson of the Barclay Street Church, who was noted for two things—his remarkable children's sermons and his no less remarkable and highly detailed prayers in which he is reported to have reminded the Almighty of a wide variety of things, like the feet of the policemen on their beats on cold nights. My interest in him, however, was partly based on the fact that he, with the elder John Kelman, had gone down to Newcastle to listen to two unknown American evangelists and on the strength of their report of the work of these men, they had been invited to Edinburgh in the year 1873. I went often to the New North where a son of this same Kelman was

preaching acceptably, especially to students. More must be said of him. Or you might go to St. Andrew's in Drumsheugh Gardens where W. M. MacGregor was preaching the sermons which best satisfied Marcus Dods. Dr. Dods told me once, as we met in the aisle, he had never heard a commonplace sentence from MacGregor. The audiences here were not large, and I learned then a lesson I have never forgotten; that the best preaching does not always draw the largest numbers. Robertson of Brighton, we are told, preached to a handful only, in his short life. This may be a comfort to a hard-working minister who sees his brother down the street packing them in, but it must not be too *much* comfort, for people sometimes stay away from poor sermons as well as from good. It emphatically does *not* mean that small audiences are a *sign* of good preaching. The foolishness of preaching is not the same thing as foolish preaching.

You had your choice of all these and others, too, for both the Methodist and the Jesuits had strong men in Edinburgh. But the chances were, especially if you were a stranger, or in Edinburgh for a short time, you would join one of the queues on the outside of Free St. George's and listen to Alexander Whyte or Hugh Black, the former, it was claimed, blackening the saints, and the latter whitewashing the sinners. Of Black we need not speak, for by far the greater part of his life has been spent in this country at Union, and in a sense he is one of us. Of Whyte I would speak, but it is appropriate to speak of him last of all as the greatest. It was my lot to know two of Dr. Whyte's successors, the present incumbent, James Black, of whom I have already spoken and who has been heard often in this country, and John Kelman. It was during my first year in Edinburgh that I met him at a small dinner. Afterwards I went to hear him at the Operetta House meetings. These were started by Henry Drummond and held every Sunday night for a period of a few weeks in an Opera House in a by no means fashionable part of town. Some prominent man presided and introduced the speaker of the evening. There was no pulpit, no gown, no singing, no prayer. It was really a lecture, but it had a force behind it both in Drummond's day and in Kelman's. After Drummond's death these meetings had been suspended for a time, if I remember correctly, then Kelman was asked to go on with them. I heard him, and so impressive was he that I never rested until I had persuaded John Mott and my brother to unite in an invitation to him to come to this country for the

summer of 1902 for the Student Conference, which Kelman accepted; and on this visit he stayed at our home with my mother and myself. From this time on he meant much to me, and nearly every week end of my second year I went through from Glasgow to stay with him in Edinburgh. With Dr. Kelman I used to call on his father who had had so much to do with mine, and my friendship reached to the third and fourth generation, for his daughter, afterwards Mrs. Hayes, then a small girl, used to take me walking in the Grange Cemetery. Later I was the only guest invited to the christening of her child, which was done at Chappaqua on the silver wedding anniversary of the grandparents, as they were over here at that time on a mission connected with the first World War. When Dr. Kelman did come to this country to the Fifth Avenue Church, it was against the advice of some of his friends. I was at that time at the Madison Avenue Church as a member of the staff, and I saw not a little of him. When one of my children was ill with pneumonia he came daily to the house. I had gone to Middlebury before he resigned; and when he resigned, he wired to me there asking if it was convenient for us to have him spend his last week end in this country with us. Of course it was; he came over to us from the Adirondacks where he had been to see his young associate Paul Wolfe, now Dr. Wolfe of the Brick Church, and he stayed with us from Friday night till Monday noon. It was then he told me that he felt he had been broken by his experience in this country and that he was too old to have made the move; that it was the most complete failure he had made and that it was late in life to be called upon to undergo such an experience. I saw him once again shortly before he died, having made a trip to Edinburgh for that purpose.

I have heard him called a preacher of the outer gate and I grant he may not have been as profound as some of the occupants of that famous pulpit of St. George's. But like Drummond whom he so greatly admired, his principal contribution was in his personality. He had that thing so easy to recognize and to feel and so hard to define or analyze which we call charm. This he put at the disposal of the Kingdom and spent himself without any brakes. Sunday nights in the old Edinburgh days, he would have, after a hard day, groups of students at his house till the wee small hours of the morning, and he deliberately and almost savagely burned the candle at both ends. He put into his contacts as into his letters something of himself, so that once having come into full

contact with him you never forgot him. This was true of the important as well as the humble. He told me once that it was not uncommon for Lord Roseberry to phone in and ask for a seat to be reserved for him when he motored in from Dalmeny for the evening service; he was admitted almost in secret by a side entrance.

He had thrown himself into the first World War with tremendous enthusiasm and unquestionably did too much. He was really not at the peak of his powers and badly in need of a long rest when he came to Fifth Avenue.

It would have been fortunate if he could have had for a few years a quieter parish with the opportunity to write. His notes on Palestine which grew out of accompanying George Adam Smith never particularly impressed me, nor did his first book, *The Faith of R. L. S.* And I know some of his friends in Edinburgh regretted the publication of this. But his commentary on *Pilgrim's Progress* set me rereading that classic; ever since I have always wanted both *Pilgrim's Progress* and his notes on it within reach.

My personal affection for Kelman makes it impossible for me to speak other than subjectively, and he, like Johnston Ross, who does not come into this picture at all, are two of the men for whose influence and friendship I have been most grateful.

To Alexander Whyte it is impossible to do justice. He seemed to me an old man when I went to Edinburgh; but age is deceiving to youth. He *was* just sixty-five. It may have been because for so long I had heard of him as I had of Alexander MacLaren and Joseph Parker. He wore a type of beard now seen only in pictures of the last centuries, a thin white fringe running from ear to ear under the chin and combining nearly all the disadvantages of raising a beard and shaving. He was one of the few Presbyterian clergymen in Scotland who did not wear the Roman collar, but he wore a white tie and then found his outlet for a touch of worldliness in shepherd plaid trousers of quite marked distinction. This contrast in his appearance was strangely typical of the man. His favorite pasture was Puritan theology and the names of Goodwin and Boston were constantly on his lips. Yet he was singularly modern in attitude toward critical scholarship and well abreast of what was being written and said. He read his sermons as carefully as we are told that Jonathan Edwards read his. After hearing Whyte with his strange voice reading carefully, you could better understand what

had been difficult for me to take in, how Edwards, nearsighted, had read such a sermon as his famous "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" with the handicap of holding that manuscript within three or four inches of his eyes with one hand, while he held a candle in the other. For if Edwards moved men more than Whyte was able to move me, I am thankful I never heard him. Whyte's voice has been referred to. It is difficult to know quite where it came from. It is very inadequate to describe it as sepulchral. Longfellow, in "The Skeleton in Armor," speaks of the fearful guest and his voice:

And, like the water's flow
Under December's snow,
Came a dull voice of woe
From the heart's chamber.

Even this fails to convey to one who never heard him just what that voice sounded like, and in dealing with certain themes it was terrific. It was a tremendous asset. Once heard, it could never be forgotten; and to even a commonplace remark, had he been guilty of making one, it would have added weight and meaning.

He had another asset. He was always dramatic without ever being in the least theatrical. Read some of his Bible characters to see what is meant, particularly that chapter on Ham, and then try to imagine it being preached. Most of the *Biblical Characters* were in print ere I knew him, so I never heard any of them delivered; but I have heard sermons which for vividness were an easy match for these. And I have found, when the sermon was over, that my hands were cramped from gripping the pew. I did not hear his sermon on the Rich Young Ruler; but some who did have described how the young ruler was pictured making his way down the slopes of the desolate underworld, hearing but not seeing in the darkness and gloom the devils chuckling and calling to one another. "Ha, ha, ha. He kept the commandments. Ha, ha, ha. He kept the commandments." I am well aware it must sound a little grotesque; it did not to those who sat in the crowded pews of St. George's, and they went out hearing in their ears, again, now near and now far, the echoes of that soul-destroying mirth.

He had one famous sermon that he preached apparently many times, which started out in a very idyllic and pastoral tone from the text, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd." The first part was taken up with the tender care of lambs and green pastures and running, babbling

brooks and cool shade. At a certain point his hearers were reminded, however, that the shepherd had his dogs. In this he was evidently a little under the influence of Francis Thompson. By some strange transposition, the shepherd dog became a sort of bloodhound and he called them the hellhounds of remorse. I seriously doubt if anyone has considered the use of bloodhounds for herding sheep, and certainly the intelligent collie, the quaint old English sheep dog, and the friendly little Welsh Corgys make bad understudies for hellhounds. But a little poetic license is surely permitted. There was one oft-quoted sentence in this sermon, which was to the effect that the young men of Edinburgh, with their puppy passions, which they petted and fondled, must not forget that these same puppy passions grow up to be the hellhounds of remorse. "The time will come when you will lie on your beds at night and hear their baying. You may be converted and become an elder in the church, but you will hear them baying about your house, and they will pursue you, aye, they will pursue you to the gates of heaven and leave their bloody saliva on the golden bars."

The adjective "grim," without question, applies to Whyte; and he would have been perhaps unbearable despite his dramatic power had it not been for the astonishing wealth of background and culture. He seemed to have read not only his beloved Puritans but everything else as well and, as is true of all great preachers, all was grist that came to his mill.

There is a very typical story told of him. A Highland preacher once came to see him to request his help in getting a new roof on the tiny kirk in his neglected hamlet. Dr. Whyte gave him a card to some of his elders. Among them was one of the leading physicians of the city, a man who had been knighted for his eminent service. The old Highlander went in to see the great physician and long-windedly began his story. It was a busy day and the waiting room was full. The doctor, resenting this intrusion, refused to do anything; but the old man was not to be brushed off and suggested that if the doctor *really* loved the Lord one of the oil paintings he had seen on the waiting-room wall might be sold and the proceeds devoted to a new roof for the kirk. The doctor, inclined anyway to irascibility, and now thoroughly aroused, asked the silly question as to whom his visitor took him to be—always a tactical error as it gives such an opening. The old minister accepted

the challenge and replied, "A hell-deserving sinner saved by grace." On which the now enraged doctor called his butler and had his visitor shown out. He went back, disconsolate, to Dr. Whyte with this story of being shown the door, which surprised Dr. Whyte greatly, and he finally elicited from the old man the entire story. When he at last discovered what had been actually said, he delightedly gave the old man a five-pound note and insisted he call on *all* his elders—for, said he, "I have been telling them this for years, and I could never get them to pay any attention."

Marvelous as Whyte was as a preacher, I remember him almost as well as a lecturer. Through a considerable part of the church year he conducted what was called a Bible Class, in the church after the evening service; it was open to men and only men, who absolutely filled every seat, in the days when I attended, many coming at that hour from other churches. To call it a Bible Class was a misnomer, for it was anything but that, as the subjects were men and women of the church. I heard him on Newman, on whom he spent a winter, whom he greatly admired and to whom he had, accompanied by his friend Dods, paid a visit at the Brompton Oratory. Another winter he dealt with Wesley; Thomas à Kempis and William Law were popular with him. He autographed a copy of his Newman for me. St. Theresa was another favorite, and, of course, Bunyan and his characters.

It was at one of these lectures, which I attended whenever possible, that I heard him read a most remarkable letter. It had come during the week from an admirer who shared his enthusiasm for Puritan theology, which the writer went on to discuss with a good deal of metaphysical insight and familiarity with philosophical and theological literature. It was a very remarkable letter, and as we listened, we wondered who could have written so beautiful and so learned a letter which was certainly beyond the grasp of most of us. When Whyte had finished, he waved it out toward us and challenged us to guess who had written it. Then he declared dramatically that it had come from an engine driver on the Caledonian Railroad. In an unforgettable aside (it was in these asides he was at his best) he added, "Some of you are theological students preparing for the ministry. Let me ask you, at what hour of the morning must you get up to be able and worthy to minister to a member of your flock like that?" Then he went on to say that the sermon he

had preached that morning was a poor one, he knew, but from beginning to end he had written it three times. No mere waiting for inspiration for him.

I repeat, I do not know whether these preachers and teachers of half a century ago were as large of stature as they seem in retrospect, or whether memory has conspired with affection in an attempt to portray them. I only know that after almost half a century they continue to stand out; for them and for their individuality, even their idiosyncracies, we can feel a respect it is difficult to imagine engendered by the products of our standardization and belt-line methods of the present day. Too many factors—ease of intercommunication by air or wire, by train or plane, the radio, the movies, the constant shouting of the advertisements which surround us—all work toward our hearing the same things, seeing the same things, reading the same things, thinking and saying the same things. These do not work for diversity of character wherein are found the ingredients of genius. The remark made sometime ago, that it would be a good thing to take time off from the improving methods of speech transmission and devote it to the improvement of the speech which was transmitted, was not devoid of wisdom. These men of whom we have written came out of a day which lacked so many of these “improvements.” As a savage in Africa said to Dan Crawford, “To be better off is not to be better.” Some of us who have lived long enough to look back, miss such commanding presences.

The Present-Day Task of a Theological Seminary

NORMAN VICTOR HOPE

To raise up men to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ—first through preaching, secondly through pastoral work and Christian education—this is the seminary's task.

DR. SAMUEL TREXLER, in his autobiographical volume, *Out of Thirty-Five Years*, quotes a saying from a well-known student of men, to this effect: "It is the first years after college which are the most decisive in a man's career. Any event which happens then has its full significance. The years which come before are too fluid; the years which come after are too solid." And Dr. Trexler goes on to say that "the church in occupying the energies of the young man during this critical period assumes no small obligation to the young man himself."¹

What, then, is the obligation that a theological seminary assumes toward its students? What does it undertake to teach them? What may they expect to learn from their three-year sojourn within its walls?

The answer to this question, clearly, depends on the purpose for which the seminary exists, the specific function that it seeks to discharge. This can be summed up succinctly in one sentence: the theological seminary exists in order to prepare its students for the working parish ministry. That is to say: first, last, and all the time, the seminary is an institution for the training of ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, men who expect to spend the rest of their working lives as ministers of parishes. It does not, that is, exist for the purpose of turning out directors of religious education, social workers, or church musicians—admirable and necessary as these may be. Its business is purely and simply to educate theological students for the regular ministry of the gospel, than which there is no higher or nobler calling in life.

The fundamental and determining fact about a Christian minister is that he has a message of good news to proclaim. He is not an entertainer, or a lecturer, or a commentator; he is, first and foremost, the herald or evangelist of a gospel, the gospel of God's redeeming grace in Jesus Christ. Indeed, the whole object in being a minister at all

¹ pp. 33-34.

is to proclaim this gospel of Jesus Christ, in the spirit of St. Paul: "Woe is me if I preach not the gospel!" In other words, the Christian minister is a man to whom Jesus Christ means so much that he is led by an inner compulsion to dedicate his life to the proclamation of that gospel to others, so that they, too, may share in its blessings.

But while theological students ought to come to the seminary with this gospel of Jesus Christ as a living experience in their hearts and lives, they cannot, by reason of their immaturity, be expected to understand anything like its full meaning and implications. The first business of the seminary, therefore, is to implant in the minds of its students this fuller understanding of the gospel which it will be their duty and privilege to proclaim. In order to do this, there must be devout, intelligent, and intensive study of the Bible, the inspired Word of God; for it is there that the gospel of Jesus Christ is most authoritatively set forth. To study the true meaning of the Scriptures is the basic function of the departments of Old Testament and New Testament in the seminary. How the Christian Church, guided as it has been by the Holy Spirit, has understood this eternal gospel during its strange, eventful history, it is the duty of the Church History department to explain. And how the church of today presents that same gospel, in terms of present-day categories and needs, it is the business of the department of Systematic Theology to expound. It is only on the basis of such a biblical and theological understanding of the gospel that true Christian preaching can take place; otherwise the preacher's pulpit utterance becomes the word of man, not the Word of God.

This gospel of Jesus Christ, while it applies most deeply and immediately to the individual, while it speaks directly to his spiritual condition and offers him new life in Christ, has a message for society as well. This is sometimes known as "the social gospel." But it would be much truer to say, as Dr. Paul Scherer somewhere does, that there is only one Christian gospel, which has social implications and applications. Though the soul of all progress is the progress of the soul, yet if religion ends with the individual, it ends. The gospel, therefore, has a relevant and urgent message for the corporate life of mankind, in its social, economic, and political aspects. To instruct its students in these social implications and applications of the Christian gospel is one task of the theological seminary; and this is done in some seminaries by the department of Social Christianity.

This gospel, however, must be preached; it must be proclaimed. There are some—even among good Christians and church members—who maintain that the day of preaching is over, and that ministers had better concentrate on other ways of bringing their message home to the men and women of today. For example, Dr. H. Hensley Henson, formerly the Bishop of Durham, and in his prime one of the most distinguished preachers in the Church of England, says this in his recent autobiography: "I am bound to acknowledge that, as I review my career, I am sometimes disposed to think that I should have made a better use of my time if I had not devoted so much of it to the the composition and delivery of sermons. The modern world seems to have outgrown preaching, and there is no sign that its tendency will alter."² And Dr. Russell Dicks, in his book, *Pastoral Work and Personal Counselling*, bluntly affirms that "preaching as the principal method of carrying on the work of the church is rapidly declining."³ But such a pessimistic verdict does not seem justified, for several reasons. For one thing, preaching was the primary means by which Jesus sought to spread his gospel: "Jesus came preaching." To be sure, he did other things as well—for example, he healed the sick. But there is no reason at all to doubt that fundamentally he conceived his work to be that of a preacher. Again, the history of Christianity in the world during the past nineteen hundred years bears striking witness to the importance of preaching. Says Dr. Paul Scherer:

Preaching has always stood firmly at the center of the Christian religion. Someone has pointed out that Hinduism lives by ritual and social organization, Buddhism by meditation, Confucianism by a code of manners; but Christianity lives by "the foolishness of preaching." So it has always been. The most critical and creative ages of its history—the ages of Paul and the apostles, of Ambrose and Augustine, of Urban, of Luther and Calvin and Wesley and Brooks—all of these have been the great ages of Christian preaching.⁴

Once more, even present-day experience confirms this estimate of the importance of preaching; for wherever the gospel is preached with conviction and sincerity, it does not fail of a worthy response.

But can preaching be taught? Dr. C. E. M. Joad, in his recent book, *About Education*, maintains that the art of teaching cannot be taught: a man either is a born teacher or he is not. "Any teacher who

² *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, Oxford University Press, 1942, Vol. I, p. 134.

³ *The Macmillan Company*, 1944, p. 195.

⁴ *For We Have This Treasure*. Harper & Brothers, 1944, p. 18.

is worth his salt," says Joad, "teaches by the light of nature. He does not, that is to say, require to be taught to teach. . . . Those who cannot teach naturally will never become good teachers, however hard they try and however much instruction they receive, and had better take up another profession."⁵ Allowing that what Joad here says about teaching is true—though not everyone would agree with him—is it the same with preaching? Is it the case that preachers are born and not made? The truth would seem to be that, of course, in the highest sense great preachers are born so—just like great poets, great artists, and great musicians; such outstanding preachers as Frederick William Robertson, Charles H. Spurgeon, and Phillips Brooks had commanding natural gifts of pulpit utterance. But it is also true that even born preachers have to learn the rules of grammar and syntax and the principles that govern effective public speaking, just as even born poets must learn the rules of verse-making. And what applies to born preachers applies in even greater measure to other preachers, who cannot claim to belong to this rare and highly gifted group. If a man has a message to deliver, competent instruction and practice in the art of preaching will enable him to deliver it more effectively, so that "the foolishness of preaching" will never be confused with the preaching of foolishness. This, then, is another duty of the theological seminary, namely, to train effective and persuasive preachers; it is one of the functions of the department of Practical Theology.

But preaching, while highly important, is only one element in the public worship of God. The Protestant Reformers, reacting with understandable fervor against what they called "dumb dogs" of the Roman Catholic Church, i.e. parish priests who could not preach, gave to the sermon the place of highest prominence in the service of worship—as is evidenced by the central and commanding position of the pulpit in traditional Protestant churches. In this emphasis on preaching, the Reformers were entirely justified; but in the process, they tended to neglect, and even disparage, the other features of the worship service, which sometimes were known as "the preliminaries." Of recent years, however, there has arisen within practically all Protestant communions an increasing appreciation of the importance of the liturgical elements in public worship. This liturgical revival is entirely salutary, provided it does not lead to any depreciation of the preaching office. So it should

⁵ Ryerson Press, 1945, p. 24.

be the duty of the theological seminary to train its students in what Dr. Andrew W. Blackwood has happily called "the fine art of public worship." The department of Practical Theology should explain the theory of worship, introduce them to the classic patterns of Christian public worship at its best, and thus ensure that all services that the students may conduct shall be reverent, dignified, and religiously meaningful to those who take part.

The other function of the department of Practical Theology is to train its students for pastoral work. The importance of this aspect of the gospel ministry can hardly be exaggerated—though all too frequently it is not taken seriously enough by ministers. For when members and adherents of any congregation come to know and trust their minister—and how can they do this unless they meet him personally and privately?—they will want to talk over with him their personal problems of living in the light of that gospel which he proclaims from the pulpit Sunday by Sunday. That is the real meaning of the pastoral ministry. Clearly, this is not something in any sense opposed to, or set over against, the preaching office: rather, it is something that powerfully supplements preaching and brings it home to the individual life. Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick brings out this point very well in the introduction to his widely circulated book, *On Being a Real Person*:

About twenty years ago, at the First Presbyterian Church in New York City, my stated responsibility as a member of the staff of ministers was confined to preaching. Desiring more intimate personal relationships with the congregation, and feeling sure that one major test of a sermon is the wish of at least some hearers to talk over their individual problems with the preacher in the light of it, I announced definite hours of conference when I would be available.*

Out of that experience has grown a great and fruitful pastoral ministry. The point to notice is that this personal counseling was not at all opposed to Dr. Fosdick's preaching ministry; on the contrary, it grew quite naturally out of that ministry. It is thus the duty of the theological seminary to train its students to exercise the most effective pastoral ministry of which they are capable.

Not only must the Christian minister engage in preaching and pastoral work, but he should—indeed he must—be deeply interested in his church's program of Christian education, i.e. that program which

* Harper & Brothers, 1943, p. vii.

is designed to instruct children and young people in the meaning and implications of the Christian faith, so that it will become a vital and integral part of their thought and life. Because of the almost complete secularization of American education in the public schools, and the lack of religious training in the average home, the youth of America are growing up spiritually illiterate; while even their parents are too often hazy concerning the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Just as the home has delegated one function after another of its child training to the public school, so it has for the most part abdicated its teaching of religion to the church school. And since the minister is to be the leader of his church in all its activities, it follows that he must be thoroughly trained in the field of education, if that important work is to receive proper attention. This training—which it is the duty of the department of Religious Education to give—should include a grounding in the philosophy of modern education as basic to his own programs and methods. Great advances have been made in theory and practice of education even within the past decade; and the church should not be tardy in adapting its program of religious education to the best that the public school and institutions of higher learning have discovered and made scientifically useful. The minister should not attempt to “run” this program himself; that is not his business. His chief task will be to train the leaders of the various educational agencies of the church, i.e. to be a teacher of teachers. Thus his church will become that laboratory for training in Christian living which it ought to be.

During recent years much has been heard of the Ecumenical Movement. Thanks to the sacrificial missionary endeavors of the past century and a half, the Christian Church has now been planted in practically every quarter of the known world. And this world-church has become increasingly conscious of its unity in Jesus Christ. The movement for closer union among the churches stems directly from the World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in 1910, and has increased in depth and strength through the series of international conferences between the two wars. The most important step forward was taken when, at the two 1937 conferences, at Oxford and Edinburgh, it was decided to form the World Council of Churches for fellowship and service, a Council which should embrace the vast bulk of non-Roman Christianity. Even during the war years, the process of organization went steadily on; and now that the fighting has ceased we may expect it to be completed in

the near future. Thus the church is on its way to being more united than it has been since 1054, when the Eastern Church split off from the Western; and it is more widespread today throughout the world than ever it has been in all its previous history. Theological students should not leave seminary without real awareness of the Ecumenical Movement—"the great new fact of our time," as the late Archbishop William Temple called it; and it should be dealt with in the department of Missions, or Ecumenicity as it is now sometimes called.

These are the main elements of formal education that a seminary ought to give its students. But it will have failed of its purpose if it gives any graduate the impression that once he has acquired the magic letters B.D. after his name, his education is at all complete. A story is told of a young lady who, on meeting for the first time a gentleman who was introduced as a professor, asked him, "And what do you study?" He replied, "I study astronomy." "Oh," remarked the young lady airily, "I finished that subject at college last term." But the kind of thing a seminary should do for its students has been described by the late Dr. Carl S. Patton thus:

I bear grateful testimony to the knowledge I acquired in the classroom of one of the greatest of American Old Testament scholars, Professor George F. Moore. Yet the greatest thing I got from him was an impetus to go and learn more for myself. All I learned in this way was, to be sure, but a fragment of what he could have told me had he had time to tell me and I sense enough to take it in. But all real education is self-education, and what I have learned of the Old Testament outside the classroom has been worth much more to me than what I learned even from a great scholar, perhaps for the reason that what I learned by myself I learned because I wanted to know it and not because it was in the curriculum.⁷

A seminary ought to beget in its students the desire to grow in knowledge and understanding after they have taken up their ministerial work, and indeed, right on throughout life. The great English historian John Richard Green, after the publication of his famous *Short History of the English People*, said, "I know what men will say of me: 'He died learning.'" That would not be a bad epitaph for any minister; and if the theological seminary does not succeed in implanting a deep resolve to continue to study and learn, then it has certainly failed in one of its major objectives.

Clearly, however, if the seminary is to succeed in any recognizable

⁷ *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*. Willett, Clark & Company, 1938, p. 39.

measure in discharging its high responsibility of training men adequately for the Christian ministry, it must receive wholehearted co-operation from the students. Such co-operation is at least twofold. First, the student must bring to his seminary course an open, teachable mind. For any student who comes with a know-it-all attitude, thinking that the whole ocean of God's truth is contained in his little teacup, and that he has nothing more to learn, no seminary can do very much, be it ever so well staffed and well equipped. Secondly, the student must be willing to do honest, regular work. For obviously, such a program as the one outlined above involves the serious study of serious books—commentaries, books of theology, etc.—a study that demands the girding up of the loins of the mind. It likewise requires the writing of sermons and the preparation of other academic assignments on the part of the student; and such exercises cannot be carried out at all adequately without sweat of brain. And the curious and interesting feature of the situation is this, that, generally speaking, the way a student works while in seminary is an index of the way he will work when he becomes a minister. The late Dr. A. B. Bruce, one of the greatest of Scottish New Testament scholars and teachers, once made the following remarks about those men who had been sluggards in their classwork at seminary:

I usually find that the great majority of them make very poor ministers. And it is not because of what they learn here. I am not conceited enough to think that my lectures will of themselves make good ministers; but I know that they are showing themselves now in their looseness of work and slackness of preparation. That goes on when they enter their pastorate; and so many a parish in Scotland is a sluggard's garden all grown over with moral and spiritual weeds, because the man himself is not awake and sleeps away all his day, instead of spending it for God.⁸

The golden rule for all seminary students is contained in St. Paul's well-known words to Timothy: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."⁹ Only when a student does that, can he expect to get out of his seminary course all the benefit that he should.

⁸ Quoted by W. Mackintosh Mackay, *Bible Types of Modern Men*, Vol. I, pp. 244-45.

⁹ II Timothy 2:15.

Blueprint for Seminary

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER

Another view of the proper task of the Seminary: the minister should be trained primarily as a religious artist or craftsman.

PRESUMABLY the theological seminary is a professional school for the education of ministers. Certainly ministers need to be educated somewhere. The day has long gone by when a man can drop his tools to preach in the meetinghouse on Sunday in response to some inner motivation that he interprets as a call from God. To be sure, an occasional sheep herder and tender of sycamore trees may arise, but this is not likely to occur very often. It is right that the candidate for ministerial orders go to the seminary to prepare himself for a difficult work. It is right also for the seminary to assume that the student will come from a college that has equipped him with a knowledge of the best that has been thought and said in the world.

After his matriculation, the young theolog does not at first realize that he has come to a graduate school in theology rather than to a professional school for the education of ministers. This initial blindness on his part is the result of four years of academic conditioning at the college where the emphasis has been upon research and the acquisition of large blocks of knowledge. For this reason the theolog at once feels at home in the seminary. The curriculum pattern is little different from the one back on his college campus. Just as he once crammed for English and economics, so it is natural for him now to cram for Bible, systematic theology, and church history. Not until he has nearly finished his course does the student realize that little has been done to fit him for the ministry.

This traditional theological curriculum is based upon a misconception of the nature of the ministry, a misconception that often characterizes the active ministry itself. The seminary is inclined to think of the minister as the man who knows rather than the man who does; as a research student rather than a technician; as a scientist rather than an artist. The curriculum is organized accordingly. Large blocks of theology, Bible, church history, philosophy, religious psychology, and comparative

religions are carefully doled out on a unit basis. When the student has acquired so many units of knowledge he becomes a candidate for the graduate degree and the position of minister in a church. What he is expected to do with this three-year bag of knowledge has not, as yet, been revealed to him. When he faces the concrete demands of his new parish in terms of preaching, worship, teaching, counseling, and administration, he devoutly wishes that the seminary had paid more than lip service to these fundamental needs. Witness the young men each year who feel impotent to accept the pastorate of a church. Though they have graduated from seminary and though many of them have a fine understanding of theology, they seek some church that wants an assistant minister. They do not feel equipped to minister to a church alone.

The simple fact is that the demands of the parish call for an artist rather than a scientist. A congregation of people want in their midst a man who can lead them into the reality of worship, who can inspire them with brave, clean, and moving preaching, who can teach them the relationship between life and religion, who can counsel them in regard to their personal problems and comfort them in their sorrow, and who can administer the business affairs of the parish with dispatch. Notice the verbs involved in this list of qualifications: lead, inspire, teach, counsel, comfort, and administer. These are the functions of the ministry and this is the work of an artist. The acquisition of large bodies of knowledge will not prepare a man to fulfil these functions. To be sure, if he is to be an inspiring preacher and a successful teacher, he will need to know a vast amount about his world and its history, much more than the average minister now knows. But the mere assimilation of this knowledge will not make him either a preacher or a teacher, and it will have little to do with his work as priest, comforter, and business executive. His education along these lines has been negligible. Of course, he has taken a unit or two of preaching, perhaps an academic course or two in religious education, worship, and church administration. Of these courses, the one on preaching has probably been the best. In the others there have been much theory and some technical pointers.

Such a superficial treatment of the technical aspects of the ministry, however, fails to meet those demands of the parish which call for a highly intelligent craftsman. Such a person is not one with a few tricks and gadgets up his sleeve which he can pull out with a flourish whenever the congregation falls off and the collections go down. He is like

the physician who knows both the theory and practice of medicine and is able to bring his immense resources to every medical situation. He is like any well-trained graduate of our institutes who can sketch, paint, and model in many different media and who knows why he operates and composes as he does.

The seminary would do well to examine the curriculum and teaching methods of the medical school, or better, the art institute. The courses in an art school are so arranged that the student will at once learn by doing, which is the true method of the artist. Imagine a music conservatory teaching nothing but the history of music and the theory of harmony and counterpoint! Imagine the art school teaching nothing but the theory of design and the history of painting! The first day a student comes to art school he is given a drawing board and a piece of charcoal and is told to sketch the still-life or model before him. Theory and understanding are acquired with practice. From the beginning, the art student is required to practice the skills which he is going to use during his entire professional life. Not only will he sketch and paint still-life, landscape, model, and portrait—he will also model in clay, design clothes, arrange the interior decoration of rooms, lay out advertising, and create new designs. He will do these things repeatedly. If he cannot do them well, he cannot graduate from the institute. When he has finished with school, the art student is ready for the business and pleasure of being an artist.

Why cannot the theological seminary use the same direct method of the medical school and the art institute? Why cannot the seminary reorganize for the production of religious craftsmen who can actually do the parish work which desperately needs to be done? Such a reorganization would result in three major departments of study: a central department of the religious arts supported on the one hand by the department of theology and on the other hand by the department of church administration.

Central to such a radical reorganization is the department of the religious arts. It would reflect a recognition on the part of seminary and church that the minister must function primarily as the artist. Included within this major department would be a number of subdepartments. The department of worship would be profoundly important. After all, the one regular function that the parish minister is most often called upon to fulfil is the leadership of worship. Consequently this

department would be well equipped to help him with his task. In terms of physical equipment it would include a beautifully appointed chapel where the theolog might see the service superbly celebrated and where he might practice this leadership himself. At the present time the average student graduates without ever having the opportunity of leading Divine Worship under the supervision and guidance of a teacher. That is why his ceremonial is often faulty or faltering. He needs repeated opportunity to conduct the service in the kind of a chapel that he will always remember with pleasure.

Proper equipment would also include a projection room and library of sound films depicting the celebration of Divine Worship in the major churches of the world. The student would be able to hear and see Pastor Niemöller conducting his Dahlem service, the Pope investing and blessing the cardinals appointed in 1946, the Archbishop of Canterbury celebrating Holy Communion in his cathedral, Dr. Fosdick leading the Riverside service, Dr. Sockman in the pulpit of his Byzantine Christ Church, the Paulist choristers singing the mass in Chicago, Dr. Tittle preaching his sermon in the Evanston church. Other liturgical services would also be recorded and projected. In this way every seminary student could see the great presentation of the Nativity in the nave and chancel of the First Methodist Church of Evanston. He could see Ruth St. Denis dance the Masque of Mary to the accompaniment of the choir and the reading of the clergy at Riverside Church. He could hear Ted Shawn talk about the religious dance and see him bring his address to life by dancing the Twenty-third Psalm or his processional dance to the music of Bach's chorale, "Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring." Many a minister lives a whole life without ever hearing and seeing some of these great liturgical expressions of religion. Why should not the seminary reveal these possibilities at the very beginning of the minister's professional life?

A library of records would make possible the study of any liturgical music now sung in churches large and small. Question the recent seminary graduate. He has never heard Stainer's *Crucifixion*, the Bach *St. Matthew Passion*, the Mozart *Requiem Mass*, Mendelssohn's *Elijah*, Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*, a good Gregorian setting for the Roman mass, or a fine Russian setting for the liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Nor has the recent graduate heard the fine and often simple choral music suitable as anthem material for the Protestant service. He should hear this excellent music interpreted and sung by such groups as the

Westminster Choir and the St. Olaf Choir. With this superb music in his memory, he will never again be content with the shoddy, sentimental choral material often sung in our churches. His mind will become

"a mansion for all lovely forms, . . .
For all sweet sounds and harmonies."

Standard equipment for such a department of worship would also include a library of kodachromes depicting the entire field of church architecture. Though the seminary graduate will use a church building during his entire professional life, he will be unusual if he can explain its structure and style. Through the use of kodachromes, the basic structural principles of the major forms of architecture can be set forth. Gothic is immensely more than oblong naves and pointed arches. It is a definite method of building, a method which results in the familiar Gothic style. The student will need to learn the structural principles and advantages of Romanesque and Gothic, of Georgian and Renaissance, of the modern forms which use steel, glass, and concrete. Significant examples of churches all over the world can then be shown to illustrate the final expression of these structural methods. In this way the student will come to understand the adequate housing of the liturgy. In addition to this, his imagination will be stirred. Who knows what will happen in some youthful mind as it sees such native folk adaptation of church architecture as the Chinese have done with an occasional Christian church or as the people of Stockholm have done with the Högälid Church?

Such a department of worship would be well equipped, not only physically, but also in terms of faculty. At present the average seminary does not even have one teacher giving all his time to the teaching of this central function of the church, the worship of Almighty God. One or more instructors in this field are necessary, in order that various phases of worship may be taught: the history and development of the liturgy, the Protestant liturgy and its use, the ceremonial of worship, the setting of worship, the composition of the various prayers and acts of worship used in a service, and the practice of private prayer.

The need for help in this last field was brought sharply to my attention recently when I heard a visiting chapel speaker outline a rule of private prayer for the theologs. Perhaps he did not know that he was outlining some of the spiritual exercises of Loyola which were unsuitable for the Protestant mind as a norm for private prayer. He urged these young men to practice the severest self-abnegation and ruthlessly

to suppress the ego by merging it in the mass of mankind. Apparently he forgot that we have spent thousands of years and no little pain and effort to lift the ego out of the mass, to make possible the civilized mind which alone is capable of worship. Unquestionably the entire ministry needs help at the point of private prayer, help which the seminary ought to give.

This blueprint for seminary also calls for other departments within the central department of the religious arts, each with adequate physical equipment and faculty. Certainly a strong department of preaching and public speech is necessary. Also necessary are departments of religious literature, the fine arts and their appreciation and use, church and choral music, religious drama and play production, and the important department of pastoral ministry which would develop the fine old art known as the cure of souls. This is an important art which most of us know little about. The "science" of counselling will never take its place. It needs to be combined with practice and understanding in all the other arts to develop at last the minister as a true artist.

Supporting this department of the religious arts on the one hand, would be the department of theology. Here the content of religion is taught, those areas of knowledge that represent the basic materials, patterns of thought and philosophy which the religious craftsman brings to expression in his various activities. Reduced in scope, for the seminary would now be a professional school rather than a graduate school in theology, this department would embody the former curriculum of theology, Bible, church history, and philosophy.

Here, too, changes will need to be made in line with what the minister is expected to be and to do in his parish. It was not long ago that Professor Bundy complained in his book, *Our Recovery of Jesus*,¹ that the average minister has more training in the life and work of the great interpreters of Jesus than he has in the actual study of Jesus himself. Undoubtedly this is still true. Yet the minister is expected to develop the mind of Christ within his congregation. Constant reference must be made to that mind in the various studies of the department of theology. Such an approach would be in the direction of the fine art of living, for Jesus was a consummate artist, or—as J. Middleton Murry said—a man of genius.

The other supporting department would be that of church ad-

¹ p. 5.

ministration. Practical religious education would come into its own. Recently I had occasion to ask an advanced class at seminary whether any member present had ever been taught the elemental matter of how to teach a Sunday-school class. Not a single person present had ever had such training at seminary. Of educational theory and church-school organization they had heard much, but nothing about the act of teaching. In this department such matters would be considered, along with concrete procedure in regard to church finance, parish organization, the minister's relation to the various church groups and clubs, the church office, the relation of the minister to both the rich and the poor, to management and to labor in the community. In these fundamental matters, many a man stumbles and blunders along because he does not know how to proceed. The simple truth is that he has never learned at seminary the techniques of church administration and practical patterns of education.

Some such blueprint is now needed for the seminary. We do not like the word "competition" in regard to religion. Nevertheless, there is no question about the fact that the Protestant ministry is going to face stiff competition in the future. It will come from skilled craftsmen in other pressure groups: the Roman clergy, the tabernacle evangelists, the big-time recreational experts on amusement row, the labor leaders, and the public relations men for big business. These people will be out to win mankind. Protestant Christianity will need great souls and consummate artists to present the case for itself. That is why we need a new blueprint for the seminary.

“A Treatise on Christian Liberty”—A Theological Reprint

Martin Luther (1483-1546)

Luther sent the “Treatise on Christian Liberty” along with his third letter to Pope Leo X in 1520. This letter (we do not know whether it was ever received) denounced the Roman See in the strongest terms, but showed great respect for Leo's personal character and Christian insight. The Treatise rises far above the atmosphere of controversy. Even Luther's enemies had some difficulty in finding much fault with this book, though a few did so. It is called “perhaps the most beautiful of Luther's writings, the result of religious contemplation rather than of theological labor” (Kolde, *Luther*, Vol. I). Permission to use this translation, copyright by A. J. Holman Company and the General Council Publication Board, Philadelphia, 1915, has been granted by the United Lutheran Publishing House.

“I SET DOWN first these two propositions concerning the liberty and the bondage of the spirit:

A Christian man is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none.

A Christian man is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.”

“The Word of God cannot be received and cherished by any works whatever, but only by faith. Hence it is clear that, as the soul needs only the Word for its life and righteousness, so it is justified by faith alone and not by any works.”

“The commands show us what we ought to do, but do not give us the power to do it; they are intended to teach a man to know himself, that through them he may recognize his inability to do good and may despair of his powers. . . . A man is compelled to despair of himself, and to seek elsewhere and from someone else the help which he does not find in himself.”

“We are all priests and kings in Christ. . . . Every Christian is by faith so exalted above all things that by a spiritual power he is lord of all things, so that nothing can do him any harm whatever, nay, all things are made subject to him and compelled to serve him to his salvation.”

“The power of which we speak is spiritual; it rules in the midst of enemies, and is mighty in the midst of oppression, which means nothing else than that strength is made perfect in weakness . . . so that the cross and death itself are compelled to serve me and to work together for my salvation. . . . Since faith alone suffices for salvation. I have need of nothing, except that faith exercise the power and dominion of its own liberty.”

"But should he grow so foolish as to presume to become righteous, free, saved and a Christian by means of some good work, he would on the instant lose faith and all its benefits: a foolishness aptly illustrated in the fable of the dog who runs along a stream with a piece of meat in his mouth, and, deceived by the reflection of the meat in the water, opens his mouth to snap at it, and so loses both the meat and the reflection."

"Although, as I have said, a man is abundantly justified by faith inwardly, in his spirit . . . yet he remains in this mortal life on earth, and in this life he must needs govern his own body and have dealings with men. Here the works begin; here a man cannot take his ease. . . . The inward man, who by faith is created in the likeness of God, is both joyful and happy because of Christ in whom so many benefits are conferred upon him, and therefore it is his one occupation to serve God joyfully and for naught, in love that is not constrained. While he is doing this, lo, he meets a contrary will in his own flesh, which strives to serve the world and to seek its own advantage. This the spirit of faith cannot tolerate, and with joyful zeal it attempts to put the body under and to hold it in check."

"This is a truly Christian life, here faith is truly effectual through love; that is, it issues in works of the freest service cheerfully and lovingly done, with which a man willingly serves another without hope of reward, and for himself is satisfied with the fulness and wealth of his faith."

"I will therefore give myself as a Christ to my neighbor, just as Christ offered himself to me."

"For a man does not serve that he may put men under obligations, he does not distinguish between friends and enemies, nor does he anticipate their thankfulness or unthankfulness. . . . For as his Father does, distributing all things to all men richly and freely, causing his sun to rise upon the good and upon the evil, so also the son does all things and suffers all things with that freely bestowing joy which is his delight when through Christ he sees it in God."

"Who then can comprehend the riches and the glory of the Christian life? It can do all things, and has all things, and lacks nothing; it is lord over sin, death, and hell, and yet at the same time it serves, ministers to and benefits all men. But alas, in our day this life is unknown throughout the world."

A Review of the Quarter's Fiction

JOHN C. SCHROEDER

HOW CAN a man become independent? When Guðbjartur Jonsson (hero of *Independent People*, by Halldor Laxness) left the farm of the bailiff of Rauthsmyri with a wife, an old horse, a sick dog, and eighteen ewes to fend for himself on the Icelandic Moors, he knew only one thing—he had become an independent man. He would borrow from no one; he would be beholden to no one; and he would wrest from the reluctant, gelid soil a living for himself. The croft was built with the sheep on the lower floor and a place for the family above, reached by a ladder and a trap door. The diet was fish and porridge. The family coughed its life away in the smoke of the tiny, dirty room and Bjartur's wife knew that he cared "more for the sheep than for the human soul." The only things that sustained his spirit were the sagas of the heroes of the past which he would say to himself or the poetry he improvised as he lived his lonely days with the sheep. Modern verse he hated, but the old quatrains with their simple rhymes and alliterations gave him his only delight.

But he would be dependent upon no one—not the bailiff or the schools or the church or the government. This long story of a man's struggle with a bitter soil and the cruelties of an inhuman climate, together with its cost in suffering, is the narrative of the peasant everywhere. For a time it looked as though the World War would give him a fragile prosperity, but in the end he is back where he started with his few sheep—his family dead or dispersed.

Bjartur for all his courage and all his poetry is stupid, inflexible, as stubborn and obtuse as the brutes with whom he spends his days. He rejects every new way and in his desire for independence rebuffs every human approach, living upon its illusion. As an old woman says, "Where is their independence, may I ask? Isn't most of it in their sheep's guts when they're starving to death in the spring of the year? Is their freedom worth as much as the worms that feed from eternity to eternity on the bags of skin and bones they call their sheep? And let me see their kingdom, my lad, in the colorless coffee and stinking fish of this world or the next." The women are the saddest victims of the life. Bjartur's second wife, whose only kindly comrade was the

cow, died of heartbreak when her husband killed the beast because there was not enough fodder. So honest is Laxness, the author, that he seems baffled by the perversity of his own creation. When Bjartur listens to a communist's speech—a point of view with which the author is in obvious sympathy—the peasant, however terrible his life, is unimpressed, confident he is an independent man.

Farmers and shepherds have always been so characterized. But in Bjartur the independence is an inflexibility and an obtuseness which derive from an unquestioning allegiance to tradition. He will give his life for his convictions, but he will not sacrifice a conviction to a new idea. His story is the moving tale of a simple man, caught in the forces of a world he does not understand, doggedly and courageously maintaining his integrity against a soil and a society both of which are his enemies. The land he believes to be his friend even though it deprives him of everything else; society he believes to be his antagonist even though it alone might make him human. Laxness writes this moving and sad story with utter fidelity to his character, and through it an elemental man is seen in his poetry and in his brutishness.

In sharp contrast there is Fannie Cook's *Mrs. Palmer's Honey*, a story about urban Negroes and their life in an industrial society. Honey lived in "the Ville" in St. Louis. She had worked as a maid in the Palmer household until the war offered her a chance for high wages in a factory. She agrees to cook the Palmers' Thanksgiving dinner, and immediately there is discovered the sharp contrast between Honey the domestic and Honey the factory worker. As a domestic she is submissive and servile; as a factory worker she begins to discover that she has "rights" in an industrial civilization. Honey's brother is a C.I.O. organizer while her fiancé, an undertaker, knows his place as a black man in a white community. Miss Cook, whose book won the George Washington Carver award, is a social worker who knows the problems of minorities in American life. There appear all the varieties of white opinion about the Negro and all the varieties of Negro opinion about their situation in American democracy. Honey eventually finds salvation through the gospel of the C.I.O. Interestingly enough the books says relatively little about religion, hitherto so dominant a force in the Negro's attitude toward his society. One would infer that the author believes that religion has little to offer the urban Negro, while organized labor shows the way to democracy's promised land. Many

readers may be startled by some of the book's utterances, but certainly it is an interesting commentary upon a highly significant aspect of industrial and urban America.

Singing Waters irritated me. It is hardly a novel; it is rather an illustrated travelogue about Albania, footnoted with some preaching about the evils of industrial society (particularly the American brand) and the virtues of a simple agrarian economy. The story is simple enough. Gloire Thurston, a sophisticated wealthy widow, meets Nils Larsen on a train. He acutely discerns that she is unhappy, bored, and cynical, and his diagnosis leads him to suggest a trip to Albania. The rest of the book is concerned with her adventure there, where gradually the veneers and cosmetics of her sophistication disappear in the natural milieu of Albanian society. She meets there an old New England spinster, Dr. Crowninshield, who has been devoting her life to Albania's children and an English novelist who loves the mountains and hates the cities. Anne Bridge is very British. She believes in constitutional monarchy rather than in a republican form of government. She dislikes the products of an industrial society and prefers the simpler forms of rural life. She hates advertising, which "confuses values" and "is a purely parasitic activity." Mechanization has ruined America while "there are no such countervailing influences as monarchy, as aristocracy, and the country life as an ideal." I found myself constantly wanting to heckle the preacher, although I am ready to confess that the dose was badly needed—as is probably true of all sermons even though they be scolding ones.

Margery Sharp writes a good story and *Britannia Mews* is a good example of her art. It starts with a conventional picture of middle-class life in Victorian England, with its hypocrisy, its stuffiness, its pretense, and its gentility. Adelaide Culver and Alice Hambro are cousins. The former rebels against her parents, the latter accepts her situation; and *Britannia Mews* is the tale of their life through a generation. Adelaide pays for her rebellion and Alice for her conformity. The story is charming and agreeable. There is nothing significant about it and it will soon be forgotten. Hollywood will undoubtedly pick it, and I hope that Ingrid Bergman has the lead.

In almost every civilization, Jews have been comedians. This is true in our own society. An oppressed race must save itself by its humor. Shalom Aleichem is the great Yiddish storyteller and *The Old Country* is a collection of his charming, sad, humorous tales. He

tells a story so easily it ripples along. These poor people in Poland who are kicked around by their masters have to see the funny side of life to keep their sanity. The gentle, inept Tevye says, "With God's help I starved to death—I and my wife and my children—three times a day not counting supper. . . . As we say on Yom Kippur, the Lord decides who will ride on horseback and who will crawl on foot. The main thing is—hope! A Jew must always hope. And in the meantime, what if we waste away to a shadow?"

If you ever wander about the ghetto in New York, you will hear the women shrilly calling their men. In this manner Sheine-Sheindel greets her husband who has unexpectedly returned on the eve of Pass-over after a long absence, "Tfui, you picked just the right time to come . . . when we are busy cleaning up and there is no time to say a word to each other. I don't even have time to put on a clean dress. I look like a fright. . . . May my worst enemies look as beautiful as you do in that derby hat."

The stories, however sad the situation of the characters, are never bitter. Poor, religious, oppressed, these people find their joys in simple things and their hope in a tradition that is ancient and rigid. From the Middle Ages on, the Jews have produced writers and actors who saw life with a fatalistic humor that has no sting and these stories are an excellent insight into the lives of those who dwell in the ghetto.

Tale of the Twain is a story of Japanese-American relations. It deals sympathetically with the Nisei and seeks to portray the role of the militarists in Japan and how they led the common people astray. The book is too sentimental, too ponderous, and too melodramatic. Nevertheless the types represented are interesting. Tana-ko is a Eurasian girl whose father is an industrialist and whose uncle is a cruel militarist. Her Japanese lover becomes a victim of the army while his brother, a young journalist, opposes the course his nation has taken. There are all the variations of American opinion about our treatment of the Nisei. It would be an excellent thing to put the book into the hands of young people so that they might the better understand the sad story of the Japanese people during this century. Unfortunately the style is stilted and the plot too highly coincidental; but its intent is sound and its message is important.

All the King's Men is the story of Huey Long. It is magnificent writing. Robert Penn Warren, whose insights as critic and poet have

already established him in American letters, but whose novels are not so well known, tells his story with great imaginative fervor. Every paragraph has verve and sting. The cracker demagogue pulls along with him three aristocrats whose codes of personal honor conflict with the graft and corruption of the regime but who are impotent to resist Willie Stark's magnetism and power. All the high voltage of the man's attraction is reflected in the tempo of the plot which races to its doom. Huey Long appears in these pages as the product of frustrated idealism and civic corruption rather than as the conscious fascist who knows what he is doing. His power is generated in his cynicism rather than in his ideology. Perhaps this is the explanation of the American variety of dictator. Whatever the answer, *All the King's Men* is a superb novel. Mr. Warren knows the South and comprehends the forces which effect its destiny. He is already a luminary in American fiction and gives promise of being one of its great figures.

Independent People. By HALLDOR LAXNESS. Translated by J. A. Thomson. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. pp. 470. \$3.00.

Mrs. Palmer's Honey. By FANNIE COOK. New York: Doubleday & Co. pp. 280. \$2.50.

Singing Waters. By ANN BRIDGE. New York: The Macmillan Company. pp. 343. \$2.75.

Britannia Mews. By MARGERY SHARP. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. pp. 377. \$2.75.

The Old Country. By SHALOM ALEICHEM. Translated by Julius and Frances Butwin. New York: Crown Publishers. pp. 434. \$3.00.

Tale of the Twain. By SAM CONSTANTINO, JR. New York: Harper & Brothers. pp. 295. \$2.50.

All the King's Men. By ROBERT PENN WARREN. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. pp. 464.

Book Reviews

The New Leviathan. By PAUL HUTCHINSON. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1946. pp. ix-233. \$2.00.

The modern totalitarian state is the "New Leviathan" which menaces human freedom in general and religious liberty in particular. Dr. Hutchinson believes that the churches have not yet awakened to the full threat of totalitarianism. He sees this threat not merely in the rise of specific police states, but in the general and "increasing tendency to look to the state for the ordering of all of life and every life." Although the material in this volume was originally presented as the Earl Lectures in the spring of 1945, the trend of events since the end of the war would not alter the main thesis of the argument.

Dr. Hutchinson does not attempt to examine in detail the evolution of the "omnicompetent" state, the state too strong for the liberties of its people. But he describes rather effectively the actual trends toward more and more concentration of power in the hands of government. The modern state at war gives the clearest example of this concentration of power, for war has become totalitarian. Economic crisis affords further examples of the growth of state controls, as men turn to the state in the search for economic and psychological security. The projection of such controls in the form of imperialism provides a third class of examples. In peace as in war, Dr. Hutchinson finds the growth of the totalitarian principle, containing "a tyranny, an intolerance, which is the absolute denial of the Christian principle of man's dignity and worth as a son of God."

The author is acutely aware of the corrupting influence of power, and seems to share the traditional American notion that the least possible government is the best. Thus efforts to regulate by governmental controls the anarchical features of modern economy appear to be lumped in the same general category as gangster governments, which are "organized for war and conducted in a perpetual state of war." The tendency to regard strong government as necessarily irresponsible and tyrannical confuses the very real issue posed by the menace of dictatorship. Is it the amount of power in the hands of government which is the basic problem, or the ends for which it is used and the responsibility with which it is used?

Dr. Hutchinson recognizes the need for the churches to challenge, if not to guide, the state with moral objectives. One of the finest sections of the book is the stimulating chapter on "Moral Law and the Life of Nations." The moral law is our "anchor" and "weapon" in dealing with the claim of the totalitarian state to moral authority. We need to see in it the only firm basis for dealing with governments, study its applicability to modern conditions, interpret it in terms of building community, avoid the Scylla of utopianism and the Charybdis of too easy compromise, and keep our faith in God's grace and righteous judgment. This chapter is a most valuable contribution to a Protestant conception of the moral law.

The need for democratic controls over government is also recognized. The T.V.A. is praised as an example of commendable planning, because of democratic participation in the process. Apparently for similar reasons, Dr. Hutchinson leans toward the corporative state, as defined in Roman Catholic theory rather than in fascist practice, as a possible solution to economic dislocations. He also advocates, interestingly enough, a world state as a solution to the problem of world order in

this atomic age, but does not develop the conception to show how such a state could be kept from becoming a still newer Leviathan.

Two interesting, if inconclusive, chapters are devoted to the churches' responsibility for training Christians as citizens and the school's responsibility for training citizens as moral and religious persons. The churches are urged to uphold the ideal of citizenship, to understand that "the art of politics is the art of compromise," to support methods of persuasion rather than coercion in social action and to disobey the state when conscience so requires. Dr. Hutchinson favors more emphasis on moral education in the schools.

The fact that *The New Leviathan* opens up more important questions than it answers is no reflection on the author. On the contrary, it is precisely the type of thought-provoking inquiry which is useful to churchmen.

RICHARD M. FAGLEY

Federal Council of Churches, New York City.

Discerning the Signs of the Times. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1946. pp. 194. \$2.50.

A series of sermon-like essays on the signs of the times by one of the foremost seers of this time should make interesting reading, and it does. In this latest book Niebuhr discusses, among other things, the pride of power which is the nemesis of nations; how to be angry against evil, and yet without sin; the problem of the endless "period of transition" from which man never escapes; the fulfillments and frustrations of the "promised land" as it is found in history; the paradoxes of mystery and of meaning, and of the power and the weakness of God. All these things are handled with his usual brilliance and keenness of insight.

Of course, there is a sense in which—so this critic feels—Reinhold Niebuhr is all wrong. In spite of his disavowal of formal reason, too many of the "contradictions" in which he revels are the product of an excess of rationalism on his own part. An empirically oriented intelligence would interpret many of these "paradoxes" simply as polarities in the single process of God's creative activity—polarities which complement as much as they contradict one another. Also, one may ask, why must "faith" be forever the cover and catch-all for "contradictions"? There is too much sophistication and not enough simplicity in this "faith."

And yet, in a fundamental sense, Niebuhr is always right. The pages of his book reveal a freshness of psychological insight and a depth of religious perception scarcely equaled by any writer today. For instance, the chapter on "Humor and Faith" is startling in its unexpected illumination of a subject that has puzzled so many able minds. Certainly this essay will become a classic in its field. The sixth chapter, on "Today, Tomorrow, and the Eternal," is a profound interpretation of what John Dewey has more superficially discussed as the instrumental and the consummatory aspects of experience. And the final chapter, on the "Peace of God," in contrast to the peace of nature and the peace of reason, is a noble rendering of one of the finest of Christian insights.

In brief, as long as Niebuhr sees so clearly, it is almost irrelevant to complain that he does not think correctly. And we shall continue to read him for the sharpening of our own vision as well as for the challenge to our ideas.

ROBERT E. FITCH

Occidental College, Los Angeles, California.

Religion in Russia. By ROBERT PIERCE CASEY. New York: Harper & Brothers. pp. 198. \$2.00.

After reading Timasheff's biased *Religion in Soviet Russia* and Paul Anderson's *People, Church and State in Modern Russia* with its sympathetic appreciation of Orthodoxy, it is gratifying to find a scholar at last relating the religious struggle to the revolutionary struggle. Dr. Casey has sought to discover how Russians really felt about Tsarist inadequacies, the repressive role of a state church, the need for radical social change, and the concrete returns of an emergent creative social program. Fully appreciating the dynamics of the Soviet Union, he recognizes the ethical motivation of the antireligious campaigns. "Plain facts of injustice and inefficiency had spoken bluntly to men's minds and consciences and they struck brutally, fanatically, and without due consideration at the institutions which tolerated and encouraged these social evils." Against this background he then faces with meticulous care the ideological aspects of the conflict, quoting the basic statements of Marxist theory.

Dr. Casey reads Russian and the freshest influence in the book is his interest in quoting the literature of ethnic minorities. Realizing that communism cannot be judged simply by Moscow but by the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Far East, he sets the problems of institutional religion and theology in their true context of "the conversion of one-sixth of the world's surface to a new way of life, a way which leads from buffaloes to tractors and threshing machines, from ignorance to literacy, and from the political frustrations and oppressions of working men to their responsible participation in the affairs of government." Unduly dwelling on Orthodoxy, he might well have related other religious groups—the Armenian-Gregorians, the Georgians, Baptists and Evangelicals, Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Jews and Mohammedans—to the whole development of ethnic democracy in the U.S.S.R. He salutes the Orthodox leaders for the decision to remain in Russia, to identify Orthodoxy with the people, and to utilize the war emergency to prove the social usefulness of the church; and he sees recent church-state developments and the resumption of foreign diocesan ties as the logical product of a parallel church and state interest.

Unfortunately he confines these enormously important developments since 1943 to a tiny epilogue and makes no attempt to understand the nature of the new state apparatus for meeting the needs of religious groups. A socialist society with its radically different property basis, its over-all planning and budgetary structure, is an unfamiliar context for church life. This deserves a consideration which Dr. Casey does not give it, but the friendly interest and generally acute insight revealed in these six Lowell Institute lectures suggest that the author has the equipment to expand this book into a major and definitive work.

WILLIAM H. MELISH

Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, New York.

Doom and Resurrection. By JOSEPH L. HROMADKA. Richmond, Va.: Madrus House, 1945. pp. 122. \$2.00.

The modest dimensions of this book are deceptive, for it possesses a sweep and profundity far beyond many a bulkier volume. Recently published in America, it was issued a year earlier in Britain by the S.C.M. Press. It was, therefore, completed before the ending of the war; but none of its judgments seem to lack con-

temporaneity because of this fact. "We are living on the ruins of the old world, both morally and politically. . . . All is literally at stake. No single element and norm of our civilization can possibly be taken for granted." The ending of the war has not rendered such a statement less relevant than when it was written, with the conflict still raging.

Professor Hromadka, a major figure in the European theological scene, is only beginning to be well known to the Christian community in America. "Wherever I traveled in Central Europe," wrote Walter Horton in 1938 (*Contemporary Continental Theology*), "I heard Dr. Hromadka's name mentioned as that of the ablest intellectual leader of Czech Protestantism." These words were scarcely published before Hromadka was forced to leave his chair in theology at the University of Prague and flee to Switzerland to escape the Gestapo. He arrived in the United States in 1939, has been a visiting lecturer at Union and Princeton seminaries, and now occupies the chair of Stuart Guest Professor of Apologetics and Christian Ethics at Princeton Seminary. *Doom and Resurrection* is his first book in English. It introduces us to a vigorous thinker, an "existentialist," who understands the cultural crisis from the mature perspective of one who has seen at first hand the extinction of a world—an extinction that for many Americans is only a rumor which they are still unable to believe. A reading of these pages sharpens awareness both of the threat of the abyss and of the saving power of the Christian faith.

The book consists mainly in brief but penetrating studies of four European thinkers who have seen deeply into the predicament of western man and have obviously been influential in shaping Dr. Hromadka's own thought. They are Dostoevsky, T. G. Masaryk, E. Radl, and Karl Barth. The basic consensus which Hromadka finds among them is not arrived at by the device of glossing over differences. Their viewpoints are admittedly varied. At one extreme is Masaryk, who retained throughout his life an interest in positivism of Hume, but who recognized long before World War I that the relativistic liberalism of the European intellectuals "would break down in the moment the cause of liberty and justice would peremptorily demand our loyalty, burning faith, and courage," and who concluded two of his most important books with the cry, "Jesus, and not Caesar!" At the opposite pole from the broad humanism of Masaryk (so it would appear to the superficial observer) is the drastic antiliberalistic protest of Barth. The chapter on the titan of Basle is the most discriminating brief characterization this reviewer has seen. "The Theology of Crisis was not born in a classroom or at the desk of a learned professor. . . . How incredibly complicated an undertaking it is to convince stiff-necked scribes and learned scholars that we can meet God only where he deigns to meet us, on his own terms, on his own presuppositions!"

What are the basic agreements which Hromadka finds among his four prophets of doom and resurrection, and which remain valid diagnoses of the continuing crisis?

All of them were passionately concerned about truth. They were alarmed not so much by the break-up of the European consensus under the attacks of relativism as by the moral indifference of the intellectuals to the very existence of truth. They shared a common virile love for man, especially for Dostoevsky's "insulted and injured." And all were agreed that man cannot find salvation within his own aspirations or by the appeal to natural tendencies toward freedom and community. "Sacredness of human life depends on the cause, purpose, and truth which stands as judgment and deliverance beyond the realm of nature and the

process of history. The essential question of our time is by what means to relate 'ardent devotion,' 'self-sacrificing enthusiasm,' 'fidelity,' and unqualified 'loyalty' to the ultimate Truth, and to service, love and sympathy for man."

Hromadka's language is resonant with the deep tones of one who has been shaken by the precariousness of all human life and achievement and has found in the midst of it the Ultimate Security of the soul. "Now, at the bottom of our abyss, the glory of Christ shines as the only refuge for the homeless wanderers and as the only integrating, unifying force of the new civilization." For the minister the two pages (92-93) beginning, "What does it mean to preach?" are by themselves worth the price of the book.

TRUMAN B. DOUGLASS

Board of Home Missions, The Congregational and Christian Churches, New York City.

Conversations With an Unrepentant Liberal. By JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946. pp. x-113. \$2.00.

The three chapters of this brief and stimulating book are the Terry Lectures for 1945, delivered at Yale by the President of Colby College. Their author, a lifelong liberal, is not merely unrepentant; he is, in spite of these troubled times, ultimately undismayed. Like Childe Roland coming to the dark tower; "dauntless the slug horn to his lips he put, and blew."

The pattern for the book is a happy one, though not original. It takes the form of a Platonic dialogue between two of the familiar characters from long ago, Simmias and Cebes. In their latest incarnation one is an economist in government service; the other teaches religion in a small college. They are discovered in the South Station at Boston, and their friendly argument continues while they are en route to New Haven.

The dialogue pattern serves a double purpose. It enables the author to preserve his characteristic modesty behind the façade of the gentle and generous Cebes. But what is more to the point, the give and take of candid conversation is a perfect vehicle for that unremitted act of self-criticism which is the mental habit of the liberal. We have here the author's colloquies with himself over these years, when, as he says, liberalism has been at bay. For, as he states at the outset, "the liberal would be unfaithful to his own deepest insights if he should refuse to listen to his critics."

Simmias is the man of action and affairs. In matters theological he is the spokesman for irrationalism. Cebes is the champion of the imperiled ideal of liberty. He believes that, whether the world will hear him or whether it will forbear, it needs him. If his cause seems to be in temporary eclipse, his day will come again, since history and humanity cannot afford to dispense with him. At the same time he is aware of the valid criticism that may be passed upon him; he is constitutionally lacking in some power or skill by which his gracious generalizations can be applied to grim, concrete situations. That is his intimate and personal problem.

The three chapters deal successively with the contrast between businesslike realism and reflective idealism in the spheres of politics, religion and education. The second of these chapters will be of special interest to those who are involved in the contemporary clash between theism and humanism. Meanwhile Bixler is

provocative and suggestive in his discussion of the problem of evil. He realizes, as Whitehead says, that too facile solutions of this problem are the rock on which far too many immature theistic creeds suffer shipwreck.

WILLARD L. SPERRY

Harvard Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Faith of a Liberal. Selected essays by MORRIS R. COHEN. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1946. pp. ix-497. \$3.75.

Liberalism is no afterthought for Morris Cohen, as it is for those confused minds who, ten years ago, foresook it as too individualistic and too ineffective against the twentieth century's immoral concentrations of power, but whose new formulas have now failed them. One of America's foremost logicians, a philosopher whose ethical approach to the law has influenced our greatest jurists, and a sensitive but discerning interpreter of Western culture, he has here republished occasional studies, the deposit of over thirty years of philosophic activity, which consistently combine an incisive analysis of all professed dogmas and creeds, whether scientific, political, or religious, with a courageous defense of the freedom of the human spirit. This combination, he believes, is the essence of liberalism.

Cohen's method is particularly fitted for separating the historical accidents in liberalism from its vital core; it is this task, systematically undertaken and applied to our own times in the deeply moving epilogue on "The Future of American Liberalism," that gives unity to the variety of the volume. America, he concludes, has lost its faith in liberalism and liberal institutions. Among the forces working for their destruction he lists militarism and the concentration of political and economic power, but his own deepest concern as a philosopher is clearly with the divisive half-truths which become false when men exalt them into dogmatic absolutes. The liberalism which we must cultivate as our only enduring hope will view human progress as an uncertain process rather than a foregone conclusion; it must build the essential attitudes of humility and tolerance upon the rational criticism of all doctrines, and must drop its brittle individualism for a new sense of our social interdependence.

This, of course, raises the ultimate questions of the role of Christianity in the liberal tradition, and the role of reason in both Christian theology and social ethics. Like Orton, Bixler, and other recent writers, Cohen recognizes the contribution which Christianity, particularly Protestantism, has made not only to our faith in the individual but to our sense of social responsibility. He is far more critical than they, however, of the opposite tendencies in religion; and his warnings against the dogmatism, intolerance, and irrationalism which the history of religion has shown are far more conspicuous than his appreciation for the human values of prophetic religion. Though strong medicine, the essay on "The Dark Side of Religion" should be prescribed for all religious leaders. Cohen's own sympathies, it is clear, are not primarily with the religious heritage of the West but with its rationalistic critics, the "destroyers of shams" and "emancipators" of man's intelligence.

Can liberalism today succeed with so negative a conception of reason? It is significant that the same forces which have driven social thinkers to re-examine and defend liberalism are driving theologians to reaffirm the relevance of reason as a support for Christian doctrine. In the face of our urgent need for general

agreement upon moral principles, Cohen's implicit assumption that reason need only remove dogmatic barriers to understanding in order that men may attain freedom and social insight, seems an indefensible vestige of the romantic tradition. It is rather the positive rationality of man's great moral and religious affirmations that must now be established, if we are yet to see the triumph of the liberal faith.

LEROY LOEMKER

Emory University, Georgia.

The Eternal Gospel. By GERALD HEARD. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946. pp. xii-234. \$2.00.

This book contains the Ayer Lectures for 1946. Its general approach and viewpoint will be familiar to readers of previous books by its unorthodox and stimulating author. He lectures, and writes, not as a specialist in the field of theology or religion, but as one who would suggest hypotheses. The hypothetical nature of his work is thus recognized, so many of the more obvious criticisms that might be brought against it are forestalled. As a nonspecialist he brings to his task freedom from preconceptions in biblical and theological fields, but runs the risk of too broad and facile generalizations.

The subject of the volume is variously defined. In places it is treated as synonymous with Aldous Huxley's recent title, "The Perennial Philosophy." This gospel says that life is supremely valuable, provided one knows what to do with it.

Mr. Heard makes the hypothesis that man, at the beginning of the evolutionary process, had the intuition of his sonship to the Life of the universe, and of his brotherhood with all other creatures. As individual consciousness developed, religion with its creeds, myths, and dogmas became the means by which this "intuition" was reaffirmed. But as man grew in "detached consciousness" the danger has increased that he may use his freedom from control by his instincts to give himself a lesser meaning through engrossment with his ego. This means, practically, that every advance in the way of control over external circumstances must be balanced by development of insight into his own nature, largely through contemplation and religious exercises.

As man's knowledge of the external universe has grown, he becomes aware of the lawfulness of events, even in human affairs. The author traces man's understanding of this law, chiefly in the Bible, through its earliest stage as the mechanical law of justice through its higher social level of equity, to its highest achievement in the law of love, as taught by Jesus. The historical fate of the Christian understanding of the law of love is next discussed under six periods, reaching up to our present time. Modern man lives entirely in the external; has lost all sense of the Eternal and therefore of his own true nature. The central problem facing religion today is to balance once more man's physical powers with the spiritual powers which he has largely neglected. Very briefly, the author points out simple steps for the individual, and also for the formation of a nucleus which will be a kind of modern "Tertiary Order."

This is a work which exhibits an amazing breadth of knowledge and insight in anthropology, Eastern religions, theology, church history, the Bible, mysticism, physical research and psychology. Like others by the same author, it will be a contradiction and a challenge to more parochial views. To dogmatists, whether Catholic or Protestant, it will be most unwelcome, for very obvious reasons: its

complete disregard for many supposedly important doctrines, its refusal to accept any single agent or even path of salvation, its assumption that through individual exertion of the will sainthood can be reached, etc. Many will not find congenial his emphasis on karma and transmigration. This reviewer believes that the most unsatisfactory part of the book is the author's treatment, or lack of treatment, of God. How he and his relation to man are to be conceived is very vague, and this same vagueness of necessity appears by implication throughout the work. The question of grace, for instance, is one that needs clarification.

Despite these criticisms, the open-minded searcher after new insights into truth will find here much light, both for understanding and for practice. Our civilization stands in judgment before its analysis, yet the book is essentially optimistic for it provides both the hope and the direction of a cure. It calls for nothing short of a total reorientation of individual and social life.

J. CALVIN KEENE

School of Religion, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

The Peace That Is Left. By EMILE CAMMAERTS. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946. pp. 150. \$2.00.

In a desperate time like ours, a thoughtful Christian seeks for light on the problems of peace with the intensity of a thirsty man seeking water. For there is the feeling that a Christian ought to have an answer to this problem, which is to be given through his words and his life. Yet the political situation being what it is, the Christian who is also a citizen wonders if the historic Christian answer is relevant at this moment. It is with this problem that Professor Cammaerts wrestles in this series of nine meditative discourses.

For the disillusioned and the fearful, there is no answer for a humanistic liberalism. As the author points out, the realism of the Christian faith lies in its insistence that peace is always a gift of God and can never be brought into being through human manipulations. Prayer is more important than politics. The general theme of the book and the conclusions are summed up in a paragraph in the preface. "You ask for conclusions. The first is that the supernatural and the human worlds are closely connected, and that we cannot separate them in our thoughts and actions without exposing ourselves to a catastrophe. The second is that peace, whether human or divine, is based on righteousness and that no sound and fruitful peace, among individuals or nations, can be founded on injustice or untruth. The third is that peace, like all other divine things, must be bought at a price, and that we must sacrifice our pride, greed, lust for power, on its altar. The fourth is that peace cannot be achieved through the fear of war, but only through the fear and love of God."

Christians must get back to an understanding of the gap between the foolishness of God and the wisdom of men. This is what the book emphasizes constantly. Christianity as a success cult must be destroyed and Christians must come to the sense of God calling them through Christ to a way that will seem impractical and perhaps a little mad to the man in the street. This is not to say that we withdraw from society, but it is to say that our confidence lies wholly in God.

It is time, I think, that we should turn more to the theologians for guidance in our public behavior and our social action. We have been too much influenced by men who tell us what is practical in politics. Our best advice will come from

men who understand the long and painful way of Christ. That is why this little book is so eminently worth reading. The whole mood is wise and gracious in its sincerity and its devotion. Significantly, each chapter closes with a prayer, beautifully phrased and revealing in its insights. *The Peace That Is Left* brings us back to what Christ did in times greatly different from and greatly similar to ours, and indicates what our healing part is and how we can play it.

GERALD KENNEDY

St. Paul Methodist Church, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Christian Leadership in a World Society. Edited by JUSTIN WROE NIXON and WINTHROP STILL HUDSON. The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, 1945. pp. 271. \$2.00.

This symposium by fourteen students and colleagues of Conrad Henry Moehlman achieves its actual purpose but misses its mark. Intended to honor the successor of Walter Rauschenbusch, by the weight of the names of its contributors, the volume succeeds in demonstrating the importance, in his own right, of the man who has done more than merely perpetuate a great tradition. As a demonstration of loyalty and affection and appreciation of the work and life of a great teacher, the book is significant.

But it is not an able treatment of its theme. As symposia go, it is probably better than average. As discussions of the necessity for world unity go, it is above the level of much preaching and most newspaper talk. But it does not bite deeply enough nor cohere clearly enough to make a definitive impression on the mind of American Christianity. Nearly every chapter has flashes of brilliant insight—I marked sixteen for quotation. Any one or more of these insights would have made an excellent core for a truly great book; but the fragmentary character of separately constructed papers is not overcome by binding them together in a single cover. The lack of continuity and carry-over from chapter to chapter leaves the reader with the bewildered impression of a small boy watching a circus parade. The lions and jungle beasts are all there, each in a separate wagon. Then another series of wagons and floats display the winsome and wistful forces of good. We are assured by the barkers and the bands that if we go to the circus we will see how it is done—but we do not see the show in this parade.

For example, President Mordecai Johnson ably displays the venomous character of reptilian racism in the first section of the book which states the "Issues Before Christianity." But in the second section on "Resources of Christianity," while there is no lack of assertion that religion has the power to milk the venom and tame the reptile, we are nowhere shown how it is to be done. Dr. Thurman's discussion of mysticism as a basis for world-mindedness may be of use to fellow mystics; but it is not the practical working answer which the church needs if it is to handle racism. Nor is Professor Hudson's discussion of the much-discussed notion of Community the prophecy for which we look—like most of the rest of the book, it is a harbinger of a prophecy yet to come. Harbingers are excellent people. John the Baptist was one. It is an excellent tradition to uphold—this continuing announcement of the coming of Something Greater. Yet, one remembers, the young men of Christendom have always queried, "*Where is the promise of his coming?*"

As good inspirational and homiletical writing, this book is both provocative

and stimulating. As a testimony to the effectiveness of the barbs of Professor Moehlman, it is impressive. As an answer to the problems it presents, it is disappointing.

BUELL G. GALLAGHER

Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

Now Is the Time to Prevent a Third World War. By **KIRBY PAGE**. Kirby Page, La Habra, California, 1946. pp. 123. \$1.00 (paper), \$2.50 (cloth).

The thesis of this book is stated at the end of the first chapter. "The only defense against the ravages of atomic war is the prevention of that war through mutual aid in the solution of common problems under the reign of international law functioning through appropriate agencies of world government undergirded by mutual understanding and mutual confidence." This thesis is developed first by discussion of the imperatives of world peace and a very fine analysis of the attitudes and actions of the Soviet government. The author holds that war between Russia and ourselves will come unless we have a clear understanding of the attitudes and policies of Soviet leaders and unless we meet these ideas with candor, frankness and sympathetic plainness of speech, but with a determination to co-operate.

In his discussion of international government he points out that dependence upon the securing of peace through the use of force by the United Nations is a misapprehension and stems from the faith of people everywhere in armed power. "So long as this confidence is maintained they will neither empower any international organization to use armed action without the consent of every 'great' power, nor will they cease to prepare to use their own national armies and navies. That is to say, faith in armed might paralyzes international action." He goes on to state the necessity for the strengthening of the United Nations through the development of international law. He then discusses economic and racial justice, disarmament, the necessity of winning Germany and Japan.

A large part of the book is taken up with description of the origins of World War I and World War II, making the point that developments in Germany and Japan were not due to the inherent wickedness of the people of those two countries, but resulted from a set of circumstances that would have produced similar reactions on the part of any other people, including our own.

He deals with the "Way of Jesus and the Way of War," developing the pacifist position and giving an excellent summary of the record of the churches as regards war through history, down to the present time. His closing chapter points again to the pacifist position, and states that it has been gaining strength through the years and must now become the general attitude of all Christians.

This book is vigorously written and contains an immense amount of extremely valuable material. It is difficult to grasp the principle of organization; one gets an impression of a series of chapters none too closely related. The discussion of the origin of the two wars is largely on a political and economic basis whereas the solution is stated in terms of an idealistic Christian position. One would like to know just how Mr. Page would gear this position into the particular political and economic conditions that produced the two wars and may again produce a third world war. One feels that the way of Jesus as outlined by Mr. Page is not sharply and concretely related, as I believe it should be, to the specific social issues.

L. J. SHAFER

Board of Foreign Missions, Reformed Church of America, New York City.

Peace of Mind. By JOSHUA LOTH LIEBMAN. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1946. pp. 203. \$2.50.

In the wake of war, intellectual disillusion and emotional maladjustment continue to be widespread. Countless individuals struggle with insecurity, conflict and emotional aridity. It is for these that Rabbi Liebman has written *Peace of Mind*. He recognizes that the present social order is in large measure responsible—and that a different and more co-operative culture would do much to alter the lot of the individual. But he believes that social peace is impossible so long as there is war within each personality. The book, therefore, is offered as a guide for self-integration and as an aid in the search for individual psychological maturity. It is from the disciplines of dynamic psychology and religion that the principles and resources are drawn.

Many readers will gain helpful knowledge and encouragement. This will be particularly true of those who are already familiar with the literature of depth psychology or who have had a first-hand acquaintance with sound psychotherapy. Others may find it difficult to accept without more evidence the insights regarding unconscious motivation and the related principles derived from psychoanalysis. The author assumes without explanation or discussion certain unconscious dynamics of human behavior which may be disturbing to those unacquainted with the mass of clinical data from which they have been inferred.

However, there will be general agreement regarding the importance of the emotions in daily living. The careful presentation of problems of hate and hostility, the need for self-acceptance and self-love, and the mechanisms of grief will bring new understanding and increasing freedom to those who can accept the basic premises of the dynamic psychology and the liberal religion espoused by the author. To face frankly the natural impulses and drives within the self (however unmoral and primitive they may appear) and to learn to utilize them in the service of a creative and social goal is the burden of this treatise on inner peace.

In a sense the book is much more than a guide for individuals seeking this end. It is also (and perhaps even more important) a frank examination of the correlations and divergencies between the findings of depth psychology and the assumptions of contemporary liberal religion. Such a study is greatly needed. This is, perhaps, the best popular presentation thus far made and reveals a courageous willingness to face the discrepancies and imperfections in the orthodox positions of both disciplines.

Any attempt to reconcile or harmonize dynamic psychology and theology must come to grips with several important areas of at least semantic disagreement. Basically the problem lies in the concept of the nature, the destiny and the perfectability of man. Psychology is man-centered; theology theoretically is God-centered, yet promulgates a definite doctrine of man. Liebman, drawing upon a liberal theology (which reveals at times a strong resemblance to humanism) and a free reading of Freudianism presents too facile a synthesis of the two. Fundamental agreement on matters of the origin and function of conscience is not reached. Nor is adequate attention paid to the perplexing problems of free will and individual responsibility. There is also confusion in the use and meaning of the word "soul." Christians will miss the pertinent contributions which their religion has to make in the solution of these problems. But they will, nevertheless, discover a strong stimulus for a re-examination, understanding and practice of their own faith.

Rabbi Liebman's deep reverence for human personality is evident on every page of *Peace of Mind*. So also is his superb belief in the potentialities and creativity

of man. For clergy, psychiatrists and laity alike he has done an important service. His realistic view of the individual's predicament, his insight and his faith will not be lost on his many readers.

OTIS R. RICE

Religious Director, St. Luke's Hospital, New York City.

Alcohol, Science and Society. Twenty-Nine Lectures with Discussions, as given at the Yale Summer School of Alcohol Studies. New Haven: Copyright, Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Inc. pp. xii-473. \$5.00.

This book looks formidable, with its upwards of 500 close-packed pages in six-point type, its mass of statistics and tables, and its air of scholarship. It proves less formidable upon perusal, for much of it is conversational in style. Moreover, the extremely able handling of the material presented from many viewpoints but with progressive unity, the fascination of the facts themselves, and the sense of pressing relevancy with which the studies attack one of the major social problems of our times, prevent it from being anything like a humdrum performance. It is "must" reading for church leaders, or for anyone else who wishes to be able to distinguish between fact and fancy concerning alcohol and who desires substantial buttressing by the latest scientific conclusions for his evangelical or humanitarian concern.

I say "scientific," for Messrs. Jellinek and Haggard and their immediate associates are pledged in the Yale School to the completely objective and even amoral point of view. This comports with their profession and removes any suspicion that their medical and psychological case is tainted with intents of propaganda. This in the strength of the School and of its findings. Yet, especially in the discussion following the lectures, the man overcomes the scholar. Witness Dr. Haggard's good advice: "Of all educators the temperance advocate needs to be the most temperate in his statements. And why should he strain for effect when there are enough bad things to say about the excessive use of alcohol without exaggerating?"

Many a fancy is slain—such as the ideas that alcohol is a narcotic, whereas it is more like an anesthetic; that its use causes ulcers, which it does not; that brain cells are dehydrated in drinkers, which they are not; or that a man who drinks two highballs is thereupon a dangerous driver in traffic. Dr. Jellinek persuades us that, whatever the debate over degree of impairment of faculties, the final reason for warning against driving after drinking lies in the fact that alcohol creates a temporary sense of well-being which results in risky overconfidence on the highway.

But the chief fiction slain in this book is the traditional idea that alcohol is a *stimulant*. Like a refrain the declaration appears over and over, that it is not a stimulant but a *sedative*, a *depressant*, "not in the sense that it causes a depression of mood, but that it depresses and decreases cortical activity." It acts on the central nervous system, releases inhibitions, smoothes out anxiety by enabling the subject to neglect its cause. And, along with its resultant liabilities which attend the making of man less than man, this sedative temptation is the major reason for the use of alcohol as a beverage from time immemorial to the present. Underlying its employment in powerful social custom, for prestige purposes, et cetera, it is an "escape mechanism," and has been known for such from the most primitive times. The liquor interests have had, and have, a powerful ally in this fact; the church, dealing with people wrapped in worry and confusion, should be more aware of it.

The reader will find this book a veritable compendium of reliable information. What alcohol does to the body via its concentration in the blood, and how the body handles this enemy, are explicitly outlined. The description of the various liquors, by name and content, will be a welcome revelation to the uninitiated! Both the physiology and psychology of the situation enjoy extensive treatment; the subject of heredity, inherited and congenital, is examined. Persons looking for a concise statement of the stratification of American society will find it here, as a prelude to the conclusion that the failure of Prohibition was due to our social class system; the top level did not taboo drinking, and their social customs, aped by all below, were stronger than legislative controls. Long papers trace the history of the use of alcohol, the story of attempts at legal control, the medical and psychological treatments of alcoholism. Harry Warner's competent tracing of the temperance endeavor centers in a sustained plea for man's freedom from this enslavement of his powers; Roland Bainton's recital of the church's efforts points to a combination, in the modern movement for prohibition, of initial Calvinism and the ethical rigor of the Anabaptists. Francis McPeck and Otis Rice review both case and religious history in their account of the treatment of inebriety.

The "fun" of the book is confined to the chapter on analysis of Wet and Dry propaganda, by Dwight Anderson. With certain fetching stories he displays, with humor sometimes a bit acid, the potency and impotence of the advertising both sides indulge in. The superior effectiveness of the Wets' propaganda lies not in the fact that the latter have so much more money to spend, but that they direct their stuff at the bleachers while the Drys are talking mainly to their own team.

There is a whole section dealing with the penal handling of the inebriate, with social case work, and with the various phases of positive treatment. The founder of Alcoholics Anonymous contributes an original article. Finally, there is a thorough and stalwart paper on the legal aspects of prohibition by Edward B. Dunford. This Washington attorney not only scotches the lie that Prohibition came suddenly rather than by evolutionary process; he shows that Prohibition as a public policy is now constitutionally and absolutely established by our courts, as our society may desire to use it. The manufacture and dispensing of beverage alcohol is a *privilege* and not a right, a privilege which can be withdrawn at any time by vote of the citizen. Let the advocates of sterner control, therefore, gird up their loins for further education and social action!

PAUL COVEY JOHNSTON

Immanuel Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, California.

New Testament Life and Literature. By DONALD W. RIDDLE and HAROLD H. HUTSON. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946. pp. vii-263. \$3.00.

Professors Riddle and Hutson have produced what is anything but a conventional introduction to the New Testament. Rather it is a new and very welcome type which is neither a collection of separate, individual introductions nor a history of the growth of early Christian thought, but a combination of both. It undertakes, consistently and successfully, to exhibit the books of the New Testament as products of the living experience of the early Christians. The environmental test of origin and date and the historical interpretation of events, ideas, and persons are competently applied.

There are several distinctive features. Hutson's discussion of the life of Jesus and the Synoptic Gospels makes thorough and skillful use of form criticism, following Martin Dibelius. There have been no better illustrations of the results of the application of the tests of preliterary forms and of social environment. Riddle's handling of Paul's life and letters follows principles which he has already discussed with clarity and originality in various books and articles. Paul's letters, as primary sources, are rightly given preference over the secondary account of Paul's activities in the Book of Acts. The very attractive hypothesis that the Judaistic controversy in Galatia and the Corinthian crisis fell at the same time is used to date all of Paul's letters. They fell before, during, or after the double crisis.

Having grown out of experience in teaching college students, the book is non-technical and brief—often the reader may feel it too brief, if he considers how much of controversy and scholarship lies behind apparently simple statements. All of the New Testament books, the development of Christian thought and life, and the eventual "evolution of the New Testament" as a book are treated with constant use of the original sources and from factual historical points of view. Pertinent footnotes, an excellent bibliography, and a full index are valuable features.

The book will prove stimulating because of positions taken on controversial matters. Second Thessalonians is authentic; Paul's prison letters were written at Ephesus; Galatians was written to the southern cities of the province. Jesus was basically a Pharisaic legalist, rather than an exponent of the prophetic tradition, and the "sermons" of the early part of Acts may be used to represent his teachings. It must be submitted that this picture of Jesus seems inconsistent with the historical data and the criticism of Acts. Likewise the environmental test hardly justifies the interpretation of the parable of the mustard seed in terms of modern evolutionary thought. "Arabia" (Gal. 1:17) is probably Nabatea, which lay south, not east, of Damascus. Whatever disagreements the reader may feel, he will be well rewarded by the freshness of the book's treatment of old themes.

C. C. McCown

Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California.

Man and Society in the New Testament. By ERNEST F. SCOTT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. pp. viii-299. \$2.75.

Today the world is faced, as perhaps never before, with appalling problems of social reconstruction. What help does the New Testament offer in their solution? This is the question that Dr. Scott undertakes to answer in his latest book; the work of a veteran scholar, so completely the master of his material that he can discard all learned apparatus and write in a simple, expository, almost homiletic style.

His answer to the question is twofold. If we seek for specific programs of social or economic reforms, the New Testament contains none at all. But if we seek for the principles that must underlie any enduring society, the New Testament contains everything. Neither Jesus nor the New Testament writers are concerned with a social reorganization of the present order; the conception that gives the New Testament apocalyptic its vigor is that the existing society is on a false foundation and cannot endure. The message of Jesus was fundamentally and wholly religious and all attempts to separate the "ethical" (or "social gospel") elements in his teaching from his teaching about God are utterly futile; the former

exist only as the outcome of the latter. Jesus never speaks of mankind in the abstract but only of men as individuals and it is to men as individuals that his message is directed. But always to men as children of God; his demand is that each man as an individual should recognize that he is a child of God and act accordingly, no matter at what cost to himself; the change in the individual comes first and without it no change in society is possible; no change, that is, that can have permanent moral worth.

Yet this message to individuals is inseparable from a social message. He who really knows himself to be a child of God will know also that every other man is equally a child of God and will so form his relations between himself and every other man; men of good will must produce a society of good will; if I am to love my neighbor as myself, I must have neighbors and must mix with them. Such was the ideal in the primitive Christian communities, which must be rigorously distinguished from the conception of later ecclesiasticism, for the first Christians never thought of the church as different from themselves; the New Testament speaks of "soldiers" but never of an "army." And such is the ideal the New Testament sets before us today; it is no exaggeration to say that the driving force behind the whole social movement of our time is nothing else than Jesus' conception of men as free personalities.

BURTON SCOTT EASTON

General Theological Seminary, New York City.

Jesus the Messiah. The Synoptic Tradition of the revelation of God in Christ: with Special Reference to Form-Criticism. By WILLIAM MANSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946. pp. 267. \$2.75.

The author of this volume has given himself to long, patient and careful study of the Gospels. He has made himself familiar with modern critical discussion, especially in the field of form-criticism. He here presents the major conclusions to which years of serious and discriminating study have led him.

The central affirmation of the discussion is that "before the tradition, as we have it preserved, had begun to crystallize Jesus was already acknowledged as the Messiah of Israel, the coming Son of Man. This confession stands so near to the beginning of Christian history that beside it no other starting point is perceptible," and it is "incontestable" that this confession "cannot have originated except upon the grounds already given in the life and mind of the Crucified himself."

The author proceeds to a painstaking review and evaluation of the evidence in the light of form-criticism and reaches the conclusion that "though this tradition may have been a function of the faith and life of the church this does not mean that it has not taken up history into itself and preserved it."

He holds that Jesus primarily conceived of himself as the instrument of the Divine power breaking in upon his time. His message concerning the future of the kingdom of God rested upon his "certainty" that the power of God was with him in his ministry of mighty deeds. As teacher and messenger of God he set forth both his own significance and the ways of life in the kingdom of God. His words were originally spoken in concrete situations, but in the experience of the community they came, in part, to be detached from their original roots and were free to form ideal or didactic unities in the mind of the community, and to become religious and ethical absolutes for that community.

Jesus' Messianic consciousness had its origin in the filial quality of his spirit in relation to God. It came to its ultimate point in his thought of himself as the Son of Man, the Heavenly Man, who represents the final projection of the Jewish messianic idea.

There will be, of course, scholars who will disagree with Dr. Manson's interpretation of particular passages of the Gospels. Some will vigorously oppose his major affirmations, insisting that Jesus could not have interpreted himself as Messiah since what he desired to do was so far removed from anything that his contemporaries would have been able to understand in messianic terms—a precarious argument. However, all those who believe that in the Gospels we have any dependable tradition as to Jesus, and who seek to find the truth therein preserved, will find this volume of high value.

J. W. BAILEY

Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, California.

Jesus and Our Human Problems. By ROBERT E. SPEER. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1946. pp. 194. \$2.50.

Because of his long and distinguished career as a Christian leader and writer, a book by Dr. Robert E. Speer receives respectful attention. Dr. Speer is advancing in years, but this volume shows that his mind is vigorous and his faith sure.

The book has no preface. The author does not say why he was moved to write, nor does he explain what he hopes to accomplish by presenting his thoughts. However, in Chapter Two, Dr. Speer says that while reading his Greek New Testament there came a sudden and luminous insight into the significance of the words of the Gospel of Mark about "the good news of the Son of God." Apparently this was the initial inspiration which produced the book.

Once Dr. Speer had the main idea, the chapter headings in the book logically grew out of it. Citing and expounding Scripture passages, he attempts to set forth in the various chapters "the good news of the Son of God" about the Son himself, and about God, man, society, prayer, sin and suffering, immortality.

In the main, the treatment of the themes is homiletical. For this reason the word "Problems" in the title seems a bit inappropriate. For the most part Dr. Speer does not deal with problems. He briefly proclaims in popular style the positive New Testament teaching on the topics mentioned, together with a good deal of homiletical elucidation. Poems, hymns, and long passages of Scripture are freely used for illustrative purposes.

Dr. Speer deliberately puts the Fourth Gospel on a par with the Synoptics when quoting Scripture passages to substantiate arguments and illustrate points. One may question this procedure, because John's Gospel is more an interpretation of the spirit and meaning of Christianity than a transcript of our Lord's sayings and deeds.

The book will suggest to ministers some sermon themes, along with appropriate supporting Scripture references. Chapter Five contains a good detailed study of the significance of our Lord's teaching about, and practice of, prayer.

The style is good, and the main points in each chapter stand out clearly. Dr. Speer seeks to show that the Master's teaching about the things that matter in life is lucid and practicable. The book will give a lift to the faith of the sympathetic reader.

ALBEA GODBOLD

St. John's Methodist Church, St. Louis, Missouri.

An Encyclopedia of Religion. Edited by VERGILIUS FERM. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945. pp. xix-844. \$10.00.

Not for a quarter of a century has anyone attempted a general encyclopedia of religion and related topics. At last comes this handy, desk-reference volume, which will be welcomed into many a study merely for its format. It is also reliable—the best work of 190 different scholars, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. In fact, the list of contributors is a who's who of contemporary religious scholarship in our country. Each scholar was assigned a group of articles in his own field. Brief, definite, accurate articles by a man who knows, who quotes his authorities and offers suggestions for further reading, make up this encyclopedia. The editor has skilfully shaped these tens of thousands of articles into a well-balanced and nicely cross-referenced whole.

Perhaps the first discovery on leafing through the pages is that they contain a wealth of biographical information. And not merely biography, for the intellectual stand or practical contribution of the man is stated in a nutshell. For the fathers of the church, saints, reformers, founders of religions, and others of an earlier day, biographical information and even critiques are available elsewhere. But for theologians, philosophers, and religious leaders of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such information is wanting, especially for Continentals. Where else but in this handy volume could one find pen sketches of Nygren, Vinet, Bornhausen, Brunner, Budde, Oman, Otto, Gioberti, and hundreds of others?

Non-Christian religions receive excellent treatment in this compilation. As far as expedient, information is collected and organized into one article, as for example, Buddhist Terminology, but there is also full indexing of names of deities, doctrines, practices, etc. Judaism is likewise set forth briefly, with its doctrines, history, and worship giving the essential facts which a Protestant minister or theological student might need at a moment's notice. In the biblical field, each book of the Bible is described in terms of the latest sound scholarship. Articles such as those on the archaeology, criticism, theology, canon, text, and transmission of the Bible summarize briefly the modern scholar's approach to these special fields.

The numerous topics in philosophy and ethics, both ancient and modern, are handled at more length than in other areas, as are also the critiques of philosophers and psychologists. Doctrinal terms are fully indexed for Catholic as well as Protestant theology, while in suitable cases the doctrine is traced through the great religions, as for example, Salvation. Schools of religious thought are included, such as the Groningen and the Erlangen Schools, the Dutch Radicals, etc., which greatly increase the value of the work in the doctrinal area. Controversies, sects, schisms, and *isms*, both ancient and modern, are haled to the bar and given fair treatment. The small sects of this country receive particular attention, out of all proportion to their numerical importance, but in direct proportion to the scarcity of information concerning them. The topics in church history and history, in church law and polity, in church music, in liturgy, and even in church architecture, are adequate, well proportioned, and accurate. The articles on religious journals and journalism, the list of Roman Catholic seminaries and of Jewish and Protestant theological schools in this country form highly useful and interesting additions to the religious data that are usually compiled. It is a further, and happy, surprise to discover that all the American lectureships in the field of religion are listed by name, with a cue to them all under the term Lectureships.

This encyclopedia is not strong on practical matters pertaining to the work of the church, to missions, to religious education, to social Christianity, to homiletics, sermons, etc., but there is no reason why it should be. The ecumenical movements of our own day and the recent past have been handled timidly, or not at all. This is not surprising. Rather one is amazed to find that this vast undertaking was shaped up by the editor into a work of well-nigh perfect proportions, covering as it does all areas of religious study and some related areas. It will become a dog-eared volume in thousands of studies and offices, and in every library that deals with religion.

LUCY W. MARKLEY

Librarian, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Book of Worship for Church and Home, With Orders for the Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies According to the Use of The Methodist Church. Nashville: The Methodist Publishing House, 1945. pp. xii-562. 75¢.

The Book of Worship for Church and Home is the richest one-volume collection of devotional literature ever published by The Methodist Church, containing as it does new and old treasures of prayer, Scripture readings, devotional material, and the rituals of the church.

It was prepared by the Commission on Rituals and Orders of Worship of The Methodist Church, by order of the General Conference, and has definite functional values in the area of public and private worship.

For example, the busy pastor may use it in his study as he plans next Sunday's services, for there are various patterns for the Orders of Worship—a "Working Chart," so to speak—which he may use to create a continuing variety of orders of worship without departing from accepted forms. Here are rich aids to direct him in the planning and to guide his people as they worship in the pew. To be specific, in the summer season he may use, in whole or in part, "An Order of Dedication of Seed, Soil, and Sowers" (pp. 102-07), thus helping each worshiper to realize (whether in an urban or a rural church) that "Life is a unity and is a result of the co-operative activity of the trinity of God, man, and nature." Again, one pastor, when he learned that no organs had been left at Yenching University, at Peking, China, after the invading Japanese withdrew, received the permission of his church leaders to dedicate a little-used reed organ, in good condition, for use in the work of that Methodist-sponsored school in the heart of China. On pages 487-89 of *The Book of Worship* he found "An Order for the Dedication of An Organ," and made effective use of it at a morning service of worship. That week the organ was crated and shipped to China.

Again, the minister will find help here in his pastoral contacts. There are prayers for use "After the Birth of a Child" (p. 514), "To Be Said by the Sick" (p. 515), "Before An Operation" (p. 517), and the like, which will aid him in his ministry to those who are temporarily shut-in. On pages 518-20 is "An Order for the Administration of the Sacraments of the Lord's Supper for the Sick."

One pastor makes a practice of giving a copy of *The Book of Worship* to every couple that he marries. On the flyleaf he pens a reference to pages 409-12, "The Order for the Solemnization of Matrimony," and suggests that "in calmer moments" they reread it. He also refers them to pages 263-368 where there are

"Aids to Personal and Family Devotions." In this way he hopes to enable them to "surely perform and keep the vow and covenant between them made," that they "may ever remain in perfect love and peace together." Truly the alert pastor will lose no opportunity to recommend a book of this type for regular use in the home. Here is a fine resource for daily devotions.

This *Book of Worship* seeks (1) to beget a strong sense of God's presence, (2) to guide men and women when they meet to think about him, (3) to help them express their devotion to him, and (4) to enable them the better to dedicate their lives to his service. It is recommended for your reading and use.

LAVENS M. THOMAS, 2D

The Methodist Church, Lebanon, Tennessee.

Light from the Ancient Past: the Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion. By JACK FINEGAN. Princeton University Press, 1946. pp. xxxiv-500. \$5.00.

This is the kind of book which will not collect dust on the study shelves, for it is a compendium of useful and dependable information. Its text is supplemented with 204 illustrations of unusual quality, as well as six maps and four plans. The author has traveled and studied in many of the countries with which he is here concerned, and he has made discriminating use of a vast literature. The book's timeline stretches from 5000 B.C. to A.D. 500. Its purpose is to give a connected account of the archaeological background of the Hebrew-Christian religion—not to discuss the development of the religion in the light of this background, or the problems of biblical criticism and theology.

The book starts with the story of the beginnings of civilization in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Making a wise selection of the more essential archaeological data, the author presents a vivid picture of the long sweep of history and succession of cultures which preceded the entrance of the Hebrews into Canaan. The reader is acquainted with some of the nonbiblical literatures of the ancient Near East, and can appreciate something of the more recent revelations of the rise of civilization in the Tigris-Euphrates and Nile valleys. A disproportionately small space (about 50 pages) is allotted to Palestinian archaeology of the period of the Old Testament. The author may be reckoning with the fact that there are available a number of good recent books on this subject. The treatment here is in the form of brief notes on the more important discoveries at various sites. Only two pages are given to the Stone Age and three pages to the important finds at Ras Shamra. It is clear, however, that the author is thoroughly familiar with Palestinian archaeology.

More than half the book is devoted to the archaeological background of the New Testament and early Christian church. Herein lies the major contribution of this book. A sketch of the rise of Rome and of Palestine under the Herods is followed by a discussion of New Testament sites in Palestine, with considerable attention to Jerusalem and the Herodian temple. The cities associated with the life and journeys of Paul are described, with digests of their history and the archaeological data from them. The pen of the author makes very real to the reader the city of Rome at the time of Paul. Of special importance is the discussion of the New Testament papyri with a historical introduction on the use of papyrus. The story of the discovery of ancient papyri is well told, and full attention is given to the manuscripts of the letters of Paul, particularly the Chester Beatty papyrus of

Paul's letters. We also find descriptions of the vellum codices of the Egyptian text, the Western text, and the Byzantine text. The general reader will be grateful to have at hand such an adequate summary of the New Testament manuscripts.

The book concludes with a discussion of the catacombs at Rome and the early Christian churches. More than fifty pages are devoted to the early churches at Dura-Europos, Rome, and Constantinople, and in Palestine, Egypt, and Syria. Special mention should be made of the fine description of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the churches at Rome.

A noteworthy feature of this book is the bibliographical footnotes which direct the reader to the more important sources. The general index is sufficiently detailed to add to the usefulness of the book, and there is an index of Scriptural references. The author is to be commended for giving to biblical scholars, ministers, and laymen a volume which will fill a long-felt need. His sober judgment on historical and archaeological matters conspires with a readable style to produce a really good book.

HERBERT GORDON MAY

Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

The River Jordan: Being an Illustrated Account of the Earth's Most Storied River.

By NELSON GLUECK. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946. pp. xvi-265. \$3.50.

In 1940, Professor Glueck, who in recent years has served as Director of the American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, made available the results of his remarkable surveys and surface explorations of the Trans-Jordan country and of his excavation of Tell el-Kheleifeh (the biblical Ezion-geber), Solomon's famous port on the Gulf of Akabah and the seat of his copper refineries, in a book entitled *The Other Side of the Jordan*. Now, in this new book, we are given a sketch of the life history of the Jordan River. Dr. Glueck has again placed all students of the Bible in his lasting debt.

The book has been superbly planned and wrought. The jacket will kindle the memories of all who have ever visited the Holy Land. The inside covers bear upon them maps of Palestine taken from the Westminster Atlas. The text moves swiftly, dramatically, almost breathlessly on from Mount Hermon and the sources of the Jordan through the Huleh district and the region near the Lake of Galilee, along the serpentine windings of the Jordan, from the southern end of the lake to the profound depths of the Dead Sea some 1,292 feet below sea level, and finally to the plains of Moab.

Each of the main tributaries is described (Arnon, Jabbok, Yarmuk, Zered). The major cities of the Jordan valley like Beth-shean, Jabesh-gilead, Jericho are vividly portrayed. There is an excellent section on the dolmens of Transjordan. The materials from the Old Testament and the New Testament are treated with equal appositeness and charm. Glueck reveals historical imagination, warmth of sympathy, a moving toleration, and a rare friendliness which makes him an almost incomparable biographer of the earth's most-storied river.

One's sense of gratitude is so great that any criticism might sound like carping complaint. One wonders, however, whether the Jordan can really be described as *majestic*. The population estimates of the Trans-Jordan country during Roman times seem much exaggerated. I doubt whether the explanation for the want of reference to Israel to towns in the Jordan valley from the thirteenth to the sixth centuries

really holds. I question even more whether the Israelites arrived in Palestine with the belief in one God (p. 152).

The volume is enriched with 113 exceedingly striking and attractive illustrations. But it is a great tribute to Glueck that what remains with the reader even more than the illustrations is the vividness and vigor of the content. Under Glueck's influence the modern Bedouins, whom he knows so well, the men and women of the Bible, whom he seems to have seen in the flesh, and the reader become one invincible community. It may not be inappropriate to add in a time of inflation that the price of this book is eminently reasonable.

JAMES MULLENBURG

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Religion in America. By WILLARD L. SPERRY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. pp. x-317. \$2.50.

This is the American edition of one of the volumes in a series designed to give the English people some clear and coherent ideas about American life and institutions. That the volume on religion should be published in the United States as well as in England is especially fortunate, since few Americans have any intelligent comprehension of our complicated religious situation or our characteristic religious institutions. Dean Sperry's grasp of British queries is as thorough as his understanding of the American scene, this work is in reality an "Englishman's-eye view" of American religion. It is stimulating to see ourselves from this vantage point.

To established-church-minded Englishmen, the separation of church and state is of far more significance than our whole colonial struggle, especially since the colonial story had the wrong ending. Dean Sperry covers the entire colonial period in twenty pages, then uses thirty to discuss the causes and consequences of our separation of church and state. Such a division of space should serve as a subtle reminder to all Americans of the significance of our manner of relating religion and government. The amount of space assigned different topics, however, is not necessarily a true indication of their relative merit, for the most significant colonial movement, the Great Awakening, receives but scant attention. Much of the development of religion in America cannot be understood apart from the Great Awakening; especially true is this of the movement that culminated in the separation of church and state.

The distinctive American sects are described in an understanding and sympathetic manner. Proper attention is directed to the relatively few religious groups which have originated in this country. Of the more than 250 religious organizations to be found in the United States, the vast majority, of course, were transplanted from abroad. The membership of most of the groups is extremely small; it is noted that the combined membership of 204 of them constitutes less than 3 per cent of the total.

The sections on theology, Negro churches, and church union are good interpretations, but the one on American Roman Catholicism is substantially the view presented by a prominent Catholic historian. Appendices of ample statistical material round out this useful study. Americans and Britons alike will find here something far more than the primer it claims to be.

CHARLES T. THRIFT, JR.

Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Florida.

The Christian Heritage in America. By GEORGE HEDLEY. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1946. pp. x-177. \$2.00.

Here is an excellent and stimulating little book, well written, packed with pertinent information about the leading denominations of the United States. Since volumes about these churches have been condensed into brief chapters, the book is rather like an ecclesiastical Baedeker.

Eleven denominations are treated in a chapter each: "Whose God Is the Lord" (The Jews); "Ye Shall Know the Truth" (The Orthodox); "Outside the Church There Is No Salvation" (The Catholics); "I Can No Other" (The Lutherans); "To Glorify God" (The Presbyterians); "The Whole State of Christ's Church" (The Episcopalians); "So Truth Be in the Field" (The Congregationalists); "Believers Are the Subjects" (The Baptists); "The Inner Light" (The Quakers); "Is Thy Heart Right?" (The Methodists); and "Where the Scriptures Speak" (The Disciples of Christ). Four other chapters round out the book: "Test All Things" (The Liberal Christians); "What Must I Do to Be Saved?" (The Revivalists); "One Body in Christ" (The Hebrew-Christian Tradition); and "Decently and in Order" (The Church of the Future).

The author, who is associate professor of economics and sociology at Mills College, has thus dealt with the whole historic picture of religion in the United States with the exception of Mormonism and Christian Science, which he considers "derivates of, rather than contributory to, the main stream of American Christianity; and their stories are so complex as to require exhaustive treatment."

In the case of each denomination, Hedley gives a vivid thumbnail sketch of its history, writes in a facile way of the leading characters in the church's history, shows the part the church has played in the life of the nation and in the wider field of religious thought, points out its salient characteristics, and when he sees what he considers a fault he always manages to write of it in such a way that he justifies his hope that his book "has not transgressed liberty nor failed in charity."

Hedley's concluding comment on the Presbyterians is typical of how well and temperately he handles criticism: "To sloppy sentimentality, which so easily attaches itself to religious eagerness, the Presbyterians offer a necessary and a vital corrective. It may be that they need to hear from some of the rest of us more about the love of God. No less do we need to hear from them about the will of God. They have been rigid, and to some extent will be; and by being rigid, they will help save others of us from being wishy-washy. Their theory about man starts in pessimism, by declaring his total evilness. It issues in the highest optimism, in its positive assertion of man's duty to do his duty."

Stimulating, concise, and authoritative, this book will be welcomed by many people who know little about denominations other than their own. The only unpleasant reaction this reviewer got was from the chapter on the Roman Catholic Church being subtitled "The Catholics." Certainly the Orthodox are Catholics, and many Episcopalians will not grant the Roman Church a monopoly on the name.

WILLIAM HALES

Bronxville, New York.

Faith and Reason. By NELS F. S. FERRÉ. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1946. pp. 251. \$2.50.

Since Ferré experienced his "illumination," he has been affirming the Christian

faith as intellectually valid and the ultimate and final truth for man. With a positive faith which summons reason to give assurance of the universality of Christ and the intellectual tenability of the gospel, he stands midway between those who "scramble for refuge" to literalistic fundamentalism on the one hand and to liberalism on the other.

This newest volume is another stage in Ferré's declared lifework—the preparation of a ten-volume Christian theology. To declare to our age Jesus Christ as the human ultimate and the revelation of God's purpose is a worthy, terrifying, and radical mission. It is unfortunate, therefore, that Ferré writes with a continental abstractness and ponderous idiom which tend to obscure his important affirmation.

This spiritually sensitive but word-bound thinker makes his current assignment the clarification of the meaning and relationship of faith and reason. He takes his departure from this definition: "*Right religion is our fully positive whole-response to the complete combination of what is most important and most real.*" Proceeding to analyze the nature, competence, and limits of his problem by traversing two full "circles" of (1) science, and (2) philosophy, he travels into the third "circle of religion" and leaves it as an "arc" open to the infinite, as all human inquiry must concede.

Science, he says, has not failed man, but man has failed science. Within its own circle, which Ferré systematically fences off, science is a good cow—"calm, intelligent, well-trained, careful," dispassionate, and co-operative. Science describes, analyzes, finds the nature of objects, while philosophy relates, explains, and concerns itself with meanings. Ferré defines theology as the "full synthesis of validity and adequacy whereby the present state in our process is seen retrospectively from the end, or in the light of the final fulfillment of our epoch of process."

By a demonstration of verbal acrobatics, Ferré verifies some old and well-established principles. He has made a careful statement, explored the problems posed by his definition of "right religion" diligently around the circumferences of his "circles," and deserves to be widely studied for the exactness of his method. As an answer to the problem inherent in reason and faith, the volume describes the circuit of an earnest seeker to find his way home when he has never once left the house he has built with his own hammer or the backyard shrubs which he has trimmed with his own shears. His thought-processes, his vocabulary, and his methodology continue Continental traditions well in motion before the war; they are outside the American experience in content, mode of expression, and comprehensibility. Brilliant as this work of Ferré is, the volume seems to this reviewer to crystallize a fruitless American epoch of neo-Continental theological thinking and to sound the bugle for some young scholar to state in the American idiom a religious system that will actually speak to our age on our continent. Ferré may yet be that person; his mind is still adventuring with the companionship of his experience.

Faith and Reason will remain a classic of theological thought as another volume in the projected series on *Reason and the Christian Faith*. To those devoted to the school of thought represented by Ferré, the volume presents a studied and encyclopedic system. To others the hope remains that the earnestness of his quest may be rewarded by the vivid vigor of a new discovery.

PAUL F. DOUGLASS

The American University, Washington, D. C.

A History of Western Philosophy. By **BERTRAND RUSSELL.** New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1945. pp. xxiii-895. \$5.00.

To produce an adequate history of philosophy requires an unusual combination of qualities. The writer must not only know his stuff, in the sense of his facts. He must also feel deeply and take sides readily in order that he and the reader may not become lost in a maze of details. At the same time his interest in selecting relevant material must not lead to onesidedness, and his passion for his cause must not turn into heat where light is needed.

Bertrand Russell knows the facts of the history of philosophy as do few living men. He has a special gift for clear interpretation and a sprightliness of style which holds the attention of the most jaded reader. But his feeling for the rightness of some points of view and the wrongness of others is so strong that he finds it hard to narrate his facts with the detachment history is supposed to require. The result is that when he is good he is very, very good and when he is warm he is practically torrid.

He is admirable, it seems to me, when he discusses the British philosophers. His description of Locke and the rise of liberalism makes excellent reading, and his analysis of Hume is acute and convincing. It should be said also that under his skillful pen Kant and Hegel lapse into a felicity of thought and expression that they could hardly have achieved for themselves. His treatment of Plato appears to me to lack breadth, however, and on James he is definitely disappointing. After praising the latter as a psychologist and the founder of radical empirism (without really explaining what this doctrine meant metaphysically), he inveighs against pragmatism and the will to believe. But his criticisms add little to the familiar objections and leave out of account (as James's opponents usually do), both the safeguards against arbitrariness that James set up and any indication of the difficulties in alternative views that James was trying to meet.

The style throughout is eye-catching without any loss of basic seriousness, e.g., "Nietzsche's superman is very like Siegfried except that he knows Greek." Quoting a remark in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* that Kant kept the habits of his studious youth because he never married, Russell comments: "I wonder whether the author of this article was a bachelor or a married man." Discussing Hegel he says, "the worse your logic the more interesting the consequences to which it gives rise," and of Hume, "by making empiricism self-consistent he made it incredible."

In spite of the last two quotations it is clear from this book that Russell's chief interest as a philosophical crusader is in establishing the rule of reason and combating our contemporary irrationalisms. One wishes he had been willing to develop the moral and also the religious implications of the search for truth which for him is a matter of such passionate concern. But the reader should not object to Russell's prejudices merely to make room for his own. This is a subtle and stimulating book of special value for the student who has some acquaintance with the material treated.

JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER

Colby College, Waterville, Maine.

Best Sermons, 1946 Edition. Edited by G. Paul Butler. Harper. \$2.75. Fifty-two superior sermons by the leading preachers of our day; eighteen denominations, including Catholic and Jewish, are represented.

Now to Live! By Ralph W. Sockman. Abingdon - Cokesbury. \$2.00. Arresting radio sermons for our time by a nationally known and beloved preacher.

Together. Compiled by Glenn Clark. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00. A book by "twelve men who have shared a new Pentecostal experience," having met for four years in Washington for prayer.

Foundations for Reconstruction. By Elton Trueblood. Harper. \$1.00. An original and useful interpretation of the Ten Commandments in contemporary terms.

Christianity According to St. John. By Wilbert Francis Howard. Westminster. \$2.50. A distinguished British theologian weighs various critical views on the Fourth Gospel and presents an original discussion.

Beyond Prejudice. By Toru Matsumoto. Friendship Press. \$1.25 cloth, 75¢ paper. A study of the work of Christian groups among Japanese-Americans during the war, from evacuation to resettlement.

We Are Accountable. By Leonard Edelstein. Wallingford, Pa., Pendle Hill Pamphlet 24. 25¢. A description of present conditions in state mental institutions by a Civilian Service man who worked in one.

Men and Hunger: A psychological manual for relief workers. By Harold Steere Guetzkow and Paul Hoover Bowman. Elgin, Ill., Brethren Publishing House. \$1.00. The record of the experiments in starvation undertaken by a

Civilian Service group in the Laboratory of Physiological Hygiene, University of Minnesota; the conclusions are applied to work in relief areas.

The Preaching Ministry Today. By Rolland W. Schloerb. Harper. \$0.00. "It is imperative that both laymen and clergymen should aim to clarify the purpose of preaching."

More Sermon Trails for Boys and Girls. By Carl S. Weist. Harper. \$0.00. A collection of story-sermons for children by an experienced minister.

The Light Is Still Shining in the Darkness. By Kirby Page. Kirby Page, La Habra, Calif. 50¢, 40¢, 35¢ (by quantity) (paper). Thirty complete services of worship.

Book of Student Prayers. By Jack Finegan. Association Press. \$1.50. Prayers for young people's groups, topically arranged, by an experienced director of campus religious activities.

A Guide to True Peace, or The Excellency of Inward and Spiritual Prayer. Harper and Pendle Hill. \$1.00. A classic Quaker compilation from the writings of Fénelon, Guyon, and Molinos; pocket-size.

'Pilot' Prayers. By a Christian Humanist. Epworth. 4s. A book of prayers for each day of the year, expressive of personal devotion.

An Approach to Church Membership. By Conrad Skinner. Epworth. 5s. A readable treatment by an English school chaplain.

Methodist Churchmanship and Its Implications. By H. Watkin-Jones. Epworth. 2s.6d. "Methodism is not a sect, but a Church."

The "Ministry for Tomorrow" Series. Federal Council: Association Press. 50¢ each (paper). **We Have This Ministry** (Church Vocations for

Men and Women). By leaders in eleven different fields. (Also \$1.50 cloth.) **Look At the Ministry.** By John Oliver Nelson. Presentation through photographs for young people seeking a vocation. **A Young Man's View of the Ministry.** By S. M. Shoemaker. An essay that has become a classic.

Trials of the Great Men of the Bible. By Clarence E. Macartney. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. "It is unfortunate that the word 'probation' has dropped out of the language of the preacher today."

Whose Leaf Shall Not Wither. By James M. Lichliter. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. "The man whose major concern is with the fundamental moral and spiritual laws of life is not only happy, but is also *alive*—'like a tree'"

Sermon Nuggets in Stories. By William L. Stidger. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. This author offers another collection of "short short stories" full of seeds for sermons.

The Corinthian Letters of Paul. By G. Campbell Morgan. Revell. \$3.00. Expository studies of the two Corinthian Epistles.

Christianity Rightly So Called. By Samuel G. Craig. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. \$2.00. A statement of the Christian faith from a fundamentalist standpoint and of the issues between it and liberalism.

The Society Kit, Vol. IV, and The Junior-Hi Kit, No. 3. Westminster. \$2.50 and \$2.00 (paper). Edited by Park Hays Miller and Margaret Gibson Hummel. Detailed, well-planned programs and suggestions, respectively, for church young people's groups and intermediates; conservative standpoint.

Preaching from Samuel. By Andrew W. Blackwood. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$2.00. These biblical accounts of a postwar period have homiletic possibilities for our time.

Hitler's Professors. The Part of Scholarship in Germany's Crimes Against the Jewish People. By Max Weinreich. New York: Yiddish Scientific Institute (Yivo). A documented study of the part played by German scholars in giving antisemitism a "scientific" backing.

The Consecration of Power and Intelligence. By Claris Edwin Silcox. Bruce Humphries. 35¢ paper. A Canadian addresses theologues at Andover-Newton. "It is later than you think; the issue is theological."

India at the Threshold. By L. Winifred Bryce. Friendship Press. \$1.00 cloth, 60¢ paper.

Salute to India. By J. Z. Hodge. Friendship Press. \$1.25 cloth, 60¢ paper. These and others form an excellent series on "India," one of the Friendship Press's two topics for 1946-47.